Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
MAY 13 1975

IN THE

# Supreme Court of the United States

DOCKET NO. 74-1421

PAUL CASHEN and IRENE CASHEN,

*Petitioners,*

*vs.*

FRANK SPANN, ROBERT BICKLEY, CHARLES M. EGAN, JR., JOHN DUNNE, individually and as servant, agent or employee of CHARLES EGAN, JR., "JOHN DOE," being a fictitious name of the "Reliable Informer," NEW JERSEY BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY, ANTHONY DE BIASI, THE COUNTY OF MORRIS and the BOROUGH OF WHARTON,

*Respondents.*

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

# PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

ACCARDI & KOCH,
*Attorneys for Petitioners,*
Nine Clinton Street,
Newark, New Jersey 07102

JOSEPH S. ACCARDI
*On the Petition*

N. J. Appellate Printing Co., Inc., Woodbridge, N. J. (201) 636-2030

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of New Jersey ..... 1
Citations to Opinion Below ..... 1
Jurisdiction ..... 1
Questions Presented ..... 2
Constitutional Provisions and Statutes Involved ..... 2
Statement of Facts ..... 3
How Federal Questions are Presented ..... 7
Reasons for Granting the Writ ..... 9
Conclusion ..... 13

CASES CITED:

Black v. Sheraton Corporation of America, 47 F.R.D. 263 (D.D.C. 1969) ..... 12
Brocchicchio v. Curtis Publishing Company, 203 F. Supp. 403 (E.D. Pa. 1962) ..... 12
Drowin v. State, 160 A.2d 85 (1960) ..... 12
Nolan v. United States, 423 F.2d 1031 (10th Cir. 1969) ..... 4
Quarles & Butler, In re, 158 U.S. 532 (1895) ..... 10
Roviaro v. U.S., 353 U.S. 53 (1957) ..... 8, 9, 10
Scher v. U.S., 305 U.S. 251 (1938) ..... 10
State v. Burnett, 42 N.J. 377 (1963) ..... 5, 10

TABLE OF CONTENTS


CASES CITED:

State v. Oliver,
50 N.J. 39 (1967) ..... 10

United States v. Covello,
410 F.2d 536 (2d Cir. 1969) ..... 4

Westinghouse Electric Corporation v. City of Burlington,
122 U.S. App. D.C. 65, 351 F.2d 762
(C.A.D.C. 1965) on remand 246 F. Supp. 839
(D.D.C. 1965) ..... 12

U.S. CONSTITUTION CITED:

Fourth Amendment ..... 1, 2, 8

Fifth Amendment ..... 1, 2, 8

Sixth Amendment ..... 1, 2, 8

Fourteenth Amendment ..... 1, 2, 8

U.S. CODES CITED:

28 U.S.C. Section 1257(3) ..... 1

47 U.S.C. Sec. 605 (1968) ..... 4

N.J. CONSTITUTION CITED:

Article I, Paragraph 1 ..... 2, 8

STATUTE CITED:

N.J.S.A. 2A:84A-28 ..... 2, 9, 11

RULE CITED:

Evidence Rule 36 ..... 2, 9, 11




TABLE OF CONTENTS

## APPENDIX


Appendix A

Constitutional Provisions and Statutes Involved ..... 1a

United States Constitution ..... 1a

Appendix B

Opinion of the Court ..... 4a

## PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSEY

To the Honorable, the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States:

Your petitioners, Paul Cashen and Irene Cashen, respectfuily pray that a writ of certiorari issue to review the decision of the Supreme Court of New Jersey which modifiled and affirmed the decision of the Appellate Division of the Superior Court of New Jersey which latter court ordered the disclosure of the identify of an informer in this civil case.

## CITATIONS TO OPINION BELOW

The opinion of the Superior Court, Appellate Division delivered by Lynch, J.A.D. is reported in 125 N.J. Super. 386 (App. Div. 1973).

The opinion of the Supreme Court of New Jersey is reported in 66 N.J. 541 (1975) and is attached hereto as Appendix B, *infra*.

## JURISDICTION

The judgment of the Superior Court, Appellate Division was entered on November 2, 1973, The Judgment of the Supreme Court of New Jersey which modified and affirmed the judgment of the Appellate Division was entered on February 25, 1975. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1257 (3) since the petitioner's rights under the Fourth, Fifth, Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States are drawn in question.

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

The following questions are presented by this appeal:

1. Whether an informer is entitled to immunity from suit, based upon the privilege of nondisclosure granted to the Government, when the information given by the informer is demonstrably false, malicious, libelous and defamatory?

2. Whether nondisclosure of an informer in a civil case deprives the petitioners of their rights to due process of law under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution?

3. Whether the privilege of nondisclosure of the identify of an informer is applicable in civil cases and if so, what standard is to be applied?

## CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND STATUTES INVOLVED

The statutory and constitutional provisions involved are New Jersey Statutes Annotated 2A:84A-28 and Evidence Rule 36 and the Fourth, Fifth, Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, and New Jersey Constitution Article I, Paragraph 1, all of which are printed in Appendix A. *infra*.



## STATEMENT OF FACTS

On June 19, 1970, detectives of the Morris County Prosecutor's Office and police of the Borough of Wharton, armed with a search warrant and seeking evidence of bookmaking and lottery, broke into the home of the plaintiffs. As we now know the raid was a bizarre mistake. Plaintiffs, a relatively elderly retired couple, were completely innocent of any wrongdoing, and utterly without connection with gambling or other illegal activity of any kind.

By an amended complaint, plaintiffs sued Prosecutor Egan, detectives Bickley, Spann, Dunne and DeBiasi, one "John Doe," being a fictitious name of a "reliable informer" (who allegedly gave information that plaintiff Paul Cashen was involved in gambling activities), the New Jersey Bell Telephone Company (Telephone Company), the County of Morris (County) and the Borough of Wharton (Borough). The amended complaint against the County, defendant officials and Telephone Company, charged false arrest and imprisonment, libel and slander, invasion of privacy and assault and battery. It also charged that the Telephone Company, through its employees, negligently and wantonly supplied false information to the Prosecutor's detectives with respect to telephone calls made to plaintiff, Paul Cashen.

The answers of defendant Prosecutor, detectives, and the County, among other things, set up the defenses of immunity and failure of plaintiffs to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. Those defendants moved for summary judgment in their favor under, as they stated, "the doctrine of judicial immunity and its application covering conduct in the realm of the public prosecutor." Defendant Telephone Company also moved for summary

judgment, claiming that it acted in the premises in compliance with subpoena and other lawful orders of the Prosecutor and hence was cloaked with the same immunity as the Prosecutor. The Company also claimed that provisions of the Communications Act of 1934, Sec. 605, amended, 47 U.S.C. Sec. 605 (1968), absolved it from liability. The trial court granted summary judgment in favor of all defendants. Plaintiffs appeal from said judgment except, no appeal has been taken from the summary judgment which had earlier been granted in favor of the Borough.

Plaintiffs also claim that the error of the trial court in granting summary judgment to defendants subsumed the court's further error in refusing to compel the defendants to disclose the identity of the co-called "reliable informer" referred to in the affidavit of defendant Bickley which was the basis upon which the search warrant was issued.

The basic reasoning of the trial judge in granting summary judgment in favor of defendant Prosecutor and detectives was that since, in his view, there was no showing of malice on their part or that they acted for "personal reasons of their own or distinct from their required duty," they were immune from suit. Since the County of Morris was sued on the theory that such officials were its agents, the County was likewise absolved.

As to defendant, Telephone Company, the court held there was no liability because it acted pursuant to subpoena and, under the decisions in *United States v. Covello*, 410 F.2d 536 (2d Cir. 1969) and *Nolan v. United States*, 423 F.2d 1031 (10th Cir. 1969), and 47 U.S.C.A., Sec. 605, the Company was not liable.



In ruling that plaintiffs were not entitled to disclosure of the identify of the "reliable informer," the trial court held that the policy considerations which dictate nondisclosure of such information in criminal cases, expounded in *State v. Burnett*, 42 N.J. 377 (1963), and other cases, are likewise controlling in this civil case and preclude such disclosure.

The affidavit upon which the issuance of the search warrant was based was sworn to by defendant Bickley. It read, so far as here pertinent, as follows:

> On Monday, June 15, 1970, Det. Spann checked with the N.J. Bell Telephone Company as to phone calls made from 335-6508 and 539-6548, and it was learned from the Telephone Company that numerous calls were made to the residence at Nine Crater Avenue in Wharton, N.J., telephone number 366-3115 and telephone number 328-5364, and also telephone number 743-1133 in Bloomfield, New Jersey. A further check with the N.J. Bell Telephone Company revealed that the telephone number 366-3115, is listed to one Paul Cashen, Nine Crater Avenue, Wharton, N.J.; telephone number 328-5634 is listed to the U.S. Government, Picatinny Arsenal, Dover, N.J. Building 94 QAD and in control of Paul Cashen; and telephone number 743-1133 is listed to one, Lamont Curran, 29 Washington Road, Bloomfield, N.J. Inv. Bickley called a person at Picatinny Arsenal who has given reliable information relative to gambling activities there and was advised by this informant that one, Paul Cashen, employed at Picatinny Arsenal, was accepting horse bets and number bets from fellow employees at the Arsenal, and that at least twice a day would call from one or two pay phones in Building 94 to someone with these bets. He also stated that he would keep notations in a small black notebook which he kept constantly on his person to record said bets.

> On Monday, June 15, 1970, further inquiry was made with the Telephone Company, and it was learned from this that numerous phone calls were made from the Raymond Dragos residence to Paul Cashen, to Bloomfield and numerous phone calls from John Peragallo's residence to Paul Cashen, to Bloomfield.

Telephone number 335-6508 was listed to Mrs. Virginia Peragallo, wife of John Peragallo, otherwise identified in the affidavit as being engaged in taking horse and number bets. Telephone number 539-6548 was listed to Raymond Dragos, also identified in Bickley's affidavit as engaging in taking of such bets. Concededly the information contained in Bickley's affidavit was false in the following respects: (1) no phone calls were ever made to Cashen's home by Peragallo or Dragos; (2) telephone number 328-5634 at Building 94 QAD at Picatinny Arsenal was not in control of Paul Cashen at the time involved. Cashen had worked at Picatinny Arsenal for 38 years but had retired on October 31, 1969 and had been at the Arsenal on only one day since then, in January 1970, as he drove through the Arsenal grounds to go fishing; (3) the information allegedly given to Bickley that (a) Cashen was accepting horse and number bets at Picatinny, and (b) at least twice a day called from one or two pay phones in Building 94 with bets, was false; (4) the information allegedly given by a representative of the Telephone Company that numerous phone calls were made to Cashen from the residences of Dragos and Peragallo was also false.

Detective Spann testified on deposition that on June 15, 1970 he called the Morristown office of the Telephone Company and was told that calls were being made to Cashen's home from those of bookmakers Peragallo and Dragos. Spann further testified that he normally dealt with a Mrs. Di Fiore at the Morristown Office, but that she was not working on June 15, 1970, and he did not know the identity of the telephone representative who gave him the information. On the other hand, Mrs. Di Fiore testified on deposition that she worked at the Boonton Office and not at Morristown, as Spann said. But she did testify that on June 15 and 16, 1970, she was called at the Boonton Office and advised Spann that there was no information relative to the investigation for that day. She specifically said she never gave the Prosecutor's office any information as to Cashen's telephone number. There was also testimony that calls from Dragos to Cashen would not be toll calls, and therefore would be no record of them. And Peragallo's phone would not be serviced by either the Morristown or Boonton office but by the Dover office. In fact, Mrs. De Fiore testified she was never asked to give any information relative to the Peragallo home.



## HOW FEDERAL QUESTIONS ARE PRESENTED

Prior to trial, petitioners moved for the name of the reliable informer who supplied false information to Prosecutor's detectives from Morris County.

The Affidavit upon which the search warrant was issued contained false, malicious and defamatory statements about the petitioners which is the basis for this civil suit for both compensatory and punitive damages.

The trial court denied petitioner's request. On appeal to the Superior Court, Appellate Division, petitioner again urged the above contention. The Appellate Division in its decision held disclosure was necessary for a fair determination of the cause.

Petitioner for Certification to the Supreme Court of New Jersey was granted. The New Jersey Supreme Court held that informers, whether reliable or not, have immunity from civil suits based upon the privilege of nondisclosure granted to the Government. This is an extension of *Roviaro v. U. S.*, 353 U.S. 53 (1957) and has never been decided by the United States Supreme Court.

The petitioners contends that disclosure is necessary for a fair determination of a cause pursuant to *Roviaro*. And further, failure to supply the name of the informer violates the petitioner's right to a fair trial, confrontation of witnesses and right to cross examine under the Fourth, Fifth, Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution and New Jersey Constitution, Article I Paragraph I.

The Supreme Court of New Jersey passed upon all of these questions in its opinion (Appendix B), *infra*, except the test in *Roviaro, i.e.* disclosure is necessary when it is essential to a fair determination of a cause. On this issue it remanded the matter to the trial court for further facts and set as its standard for disclosure the amount of damages suffered by the petitioners.

Federal questions are therefore, properly presented by virtue of petitioners' claim of contravention of their rights under the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Amendments as made applicable to the States by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution specifically as set forth hereinabove.



## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

1. The rationale for refusing to disclose the name of the reliable informer is based upon *N.J.S.A.* 2A:84A-28 and *Evidence Rule* 36.

> A witness has a privilege to refuse to disclose the identity of a person who has furnished information purporting to dis e a violation of a provision of the laws of this te or of the United States or a governmental div.on thereof, charged with the duty of enforcing that provision, and evidence thereof is inadmissible, unless the judge finds that (a) the identity of the person furnishing the information has already been otherwise disclosed or (b) disclosure of his identity is essential to assure a fair determination of the issues. L.1960, c52, p.459. Sec. 28.

The New Jersey Supreme Court recognizes that the privilege is not unlimited and adopted the approach in *Roviaro v. U.S.*, 353 U.S. 53 (1957).

The question for this Court to decide is whether an informer is entitled to immunity from suit, based upon the privilege of nondisclosure granted to the Government, when the information given by the informer is demonstrably false, malicious, libelous and defamatory.

The policy behind the privilege is to preserve the citizen's anonymity so that it will encourage them to reveal information concerning criminal activity to the police and protect the flow of "*vital*" information.

Applying this policy to the present case it is apparent that no valid public purpose can be served by withholding the identity of the informer. The information, if given at all, was totally false. By continuing this informer's services the public interest would be defeated. Disclosure

would not stop the flow of *vital* information, the only information it would stop is malicious, untrue and slanderous gossip.

The decision of the New Jersey Supreme Court gives immunity not only to reliable informers, but also to informers who furnish false and libelous statements to the police under the guise of vital information to combat criminal activities.

*In re Quarles & Butler*, 158 U.S. 532 (1895) which touched upon this problem was decided long before *Roviaro* which rejects the theory that the privilege is absolute and adopts the fairness concept. New Jersey has also adopted the same concept in *State v. Oliver*, 50 N.J. 39 (1967).

This decision has extended the rationale in both *Roviaro* and *Oliver* by granting to informers (unreliable) immunity from civil suits based upon the privilege of nondisclosure to the Government.

2. The privilege relied upon is not the privilege of the informer but the privilege of the Government. The scope of the privilege is limited by its underlying purpose which is the furtherance and protection of the public interest in effective law enforcement. *Scher v. U.S.*, 305 U.S. 251 (1938); *State v. Burnett*, 42 N.J. 377 (1964).

Limitations or the privilege were set forth in *Roviaro v. U.S. supra*, at 59:

> "A further limitation on the applicability of the privilege arises from the fundamental requirements of fairness. Where the disclosure of an informer's identity or the contents of his communication is relevant and helpful to the defense of an accused, or is *essential to a fair determination of a cause*, the privilege must give way." (Emphasis added).



The same limitations as to "fairness" on the privilege is incorporated in *Rule of Evidence* 36, *N.J.S.A.* 2A:84A-28.

The New Jersey Supreme Court remanded the matter to the trial court with instructions that "it is proper for the court to give less weight to the interests of the plaintiff if it appears that he suffered only insubstantial damages." Certainly a fair determination of a cause is not dependent on the amount of damages suffered by a plaintiff.

The Court never decided or even took into consideration that failure to disclose the identity of the informer would deny the plaintiffs their right to sue, cross-examine or test the defense of the police officers who have raised the defense of probable cause to make the search and that they acted in good faith.

The test to be applied is as stated in *Roviaro* "is disclosure essential to a fair determination of a cause."

Failure to supply the name of the informer in the case at bar prevents the plaintiffs from:

(a) Bringing suit against one who gave false, malicious, defamatory and libelous statements against them;

(b) Cross-examining the police officers on matters directly in issue which is a matter of right.

(c) Testing the defenses of probable cause and good faith.

The information supplied by the informer in this case is not only relevant but is the crux of the whole matter, because if he in fact gave false information the detectives may be able to show that their acts were reasonable. However, if he did not give this information to the detectives then it would appear that the detectives filed a false affidavit.

3. The United States Supreme Court has never decided the issue of whether the privilege of nondisclosure of the identity of informers is applicable in civil cases, and if so, what standard is to be applied in civil actions.

There is a split of authority in the jurisdictions. Some impose a stricter standard in civil actions. *Black v. Sheraton Corporation of America,* 47, F.R.D. 263 (D.D.C. 1969); *Brocchicchio v. Curtis Publishing Company,* 203 F. Supp. 403, 407 (E.D. Pa. 1962).

Another line of cases recognizes no difference between civil and criminal actions and applies the rationale of *Roviaro,* see *e.g. Westinghouse Electric Corporation v. City of Burlington,* 122 U.S. App. D.C. 65, 351 F.2d 762 (C.A.D.C. 1965) on remand 246 F. Supp. 839 (D.D.C. 1965) *Drowin v. State,* 160 A.2d 85 (1960).

It is important to the administration of justice in both the State and Federal Courts that this Court resolve the conflict noted above and determine if the privilege is applicable to civil cases, and if so, what standard should apply.



## CONCLUSION

**For the foregoing reasons, the petition for a Writ of Certiorari should be granted.**

Respectfully submitted,

ACCARDI & KOCH
*Attorneys for Petitioners*

By: /s/ Joseph S. Accardi
JOSEPH S. ACCARDI

Dated:

# APPENDIX

## Appendix A

## Appendix A—Constitutional Provisions and Statutes Involved

### New Jersey Constitution

ARTICLE I, PARAGRAPH I:

All persons are by nature free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.

### United States Constitution

Amendment IV.

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.

Amendment V.

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness

against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

### Amendment VI

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusations; to be confronted with the Witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for defense.

### Amendment XIV

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

## NEW JERSEY STATUTE

2A:84A-28 Identity of Informer

Rule 36

A witness has a privilege to refuse to disclose the identity of a person who has furnished information purporting to disclose a violation of a provision of the laws of this State or of the United States to a representative of the



State or the United States or a governmental division thereof, charged with the duty of enforcing that provision, and evidence thereof is inadmissible unless the judge finds that (a) the identity of the person furnishing the information has already been otherwise disclosed or (b) disclosure of his identity is essential to assure a fair determination of the issues.

## NEW JERSEY RULES OF EVIDENCE

Rule 36. Identity of Informer

A witness has a privilege to refuse to disclose the identity of a person who has furnished information purporting to disclose a violation of a provision of the laws of this State or of the United States to a representative of the State or the United States or a governmental division thereof, charged with the duty of enforcing that provision, and evidence thereof is inadmissible, unless the judge finds that (a) the identity of the person furnishing the information has already been otherwise disclosed or (b) disclosure of his identity is essential to assure a fair determination of the issues.

## Appendix B

## Opinion of the Court

Argued October 22, 1974—Decided Feb. 25, 1975.

On appeal from the Superior Court of New Jersey, Appellate Division, whose opinion is reported at 125 *N.J. Super.* 386 (App. Div. 1973).

*Mr. Stephen S. Weinstein* argued the cause for defendants-appellants and cross-respondents, Frank Spann, Robert Bickley and John Dunne (*Mr. Herbert M. Korn*, on the brief).

*Mr. Joseph S. Accardi* argued the cause for plaintiffs-respondents and cross-appellants, Paul Cashen and Irene Cashen (*Messrs. Accardi & Koch*, attorneys; *Mr. Accardi*, on the brief).

*Mr. Richard W. Berg*, Deputy Attorney General of New Jersey, argued the cause for intervenor-appellant, The State of New Jersey (*Mr. William F. Hyland*, Attorney General of New Jersey, attorney; *Mr. Berg*, of counsel and on the brief).

*Mr. William T. McElroy* argued the cause for defendants-respondents, Charles M. Egan, Jr., Anthony De Biasi, and County of Morris (*Messrs. McElroy, Connell, Foley & Geiser*, attorneys; (Mr. McElroy, of counsel; *Mr. Edward B. Deutsch*, on the brief).

*Mr. Charles A. Sweeney* argued the cause for defendant-respondent, New Jersey Bell Telephone Company.



The opinion of the Court was delivered by PASHMAN, J.

This is a civil action for damages arising out of an allegedly illegal search of plaintiffs' home. On June 19, 1970 detectives of the Morris County Prosecutor's Office and police officers from the Borough of Wharton executed a search warrant at plaintiffs' residence seeking evidence of gambling activity. The detectives allegedly relied upon information provided by a "reliable informer" in preparing the affidavit in support of the search warrant. The facts are set out in some detail below and need not be recited at length here. It suffices to note that it is now conceded that the affidavit was grossly erroneous in significant respects and that the search failed to reveal any evidence of gambling activity.

To recover for damages resulting from the preparation of the erroneous affidavit and the execution of the search warrant, plaintiffs instituted the present suit against the Prosecutor of Morris County, four detectives, New Jersey Bell Telephone Company, the County of Morris, the Borough of Wharton, and "John Doe," the "reliable informer," whose identity is unknown.

The trial court granted motions for summary judgment in favor of all defendants and denied plaintiffs' motion to compel answers to interrogatories which would have required the disclosure of the identity of the informer. In a well-reasoned and in-depth opinion by Judge Lynch, the Appellate Division affirmed the summary judgment for all of the defendants except three of the detectives, Bickley, Spann, and Dunne, and reversed the denial of plaintiffs' motion to compel discovery as to the identity of the informer. *Cashen v. Spann*, 125 *N.J. Super.* 386 (App. Div. 1973). We granted petitions for certification by the

detectives, and the State,[1] and the cross-petition submitted by plaintiffs. 65 *N.J.* 290 (1974).

With certain modifications discussed below, the judgment is affirmed substantially for the reasons expressed by the Appellate Division.

Relying on *Hann v. Lloyd*, 50 *N.J.L.* 1 (Sup. Ct. 1887), the Appellate Division's analysis of the immunity of the defendant prosecutor proceeded on the theory that the "prosecutor was cloaked with the same immunity as possessed by a judge." *Cashen, supra* at 395. We do not believe that this approach is supported by the law of this State, but in any event, we feel that there are compelling reasons for distinguishing the two forms of official immunity.

The unqualified immunity of judges is well established in New Jersey. As early as 1818, in *Little v. Moore,* 4 *N.J.L.* 84 (Sup. Ct. 1818), the court observed that it is a "universal position, which admits of no exception" that judges are immune from suit for mere errors of judgment in the discharge of their official duties. 4 *N.J.L.* at 85. Commenting on the need for recognizing this immunity, the court said:

> It is a principle which lies at the very foundation of a free, vigorous and independent administration of justice. It may be traced from the earliest periods of our judicial history down to the present day. * * * Indeed, were we to subject the judges of the established courts of justice to private prosecutions whenever the passions or resentments of disappointed suitors might dictate that measure, we should subdue their

1. On February 26, 1974 the Court granted the motion of the Attorney General on behalf of the State for leave to intervene.



> independence and destroy their authority. [4 *N.J.L.* at 85-86][2]

The principle which recognizes that judges must be free from the threat of civil suit in order to discharge their judicial functions with the independence required by the public interest has been consistently adhered to by the courts of this State in the years since *Little, supra; Mangold v. Thorpe,* 33 *N.J.L.* 134, 136-37 (Sup. Ct. 1868); *Loftus v. Fraz,* 43 *N.J.L.* 667, 669 (E. & A. 1881); *Grove v. Van Duyn,* 44 *N.J.L.* 654, 656-57 (E. & A. 1882). More recently, in *O'Regan v. Schermerhorn,* 25 *N.J. Misc.* 1, 50 *A.*2d 10 (Sup. Ct. 1946), a suit by a former prosecutor and his assistants against the members of a grand jury alleging libel, the court observed that the grand jury operates as an arm of the court. 25 *N.J. Misc.* at 19. With reference to judicial officers, the court said:

> It is settled by the great weight of authority, on considerations of public policy, that all officers exercising judicial functions are absolutely privileged in what they speak, write, or do in the performance of their judicial acts, at least where such statements are relevant and pertinent to the matter before them. Such acts are judicial acts and cannot form the basis for

2. *See also, Taylor v. Doremus,* 16 *N.J.L.* 473 (Sup. Ct. 1838), in which Hornblower, C.J., declared:

> That an action will not lie against a judge for *an error in judgment,* however prejudicial to the rights of the party such error may be, is a proposition so plain, so consonant to reason, and so essential to the very existence of courts of justice, that it needs neither authority nor argument to support it.
>
> *But* suppose the judgment to have been given *mala fides,* and under the influence of bribery and corruption, may not the injured party be permitted to aver such abuse of power, and to recover damages, if he can prove his averment! I answer no. Every argument that forbids an action for a mistake in judgment, applies with equal, nay, with increased force against such a proposition. No man would accept the office of a judge, if every disappointed and ill tempered litigant, might compel him to join issue, and submit himself to trial upon the question of his integrity. [16 N.J.L. at 475-76 (emphasis in original)].

> money damages, if the officer had jurisdiction of the parties and jurisdiction or color of jurisdiction of the subject-matter, even though in exercising such jurisdiction he acts erroneously, illegally, irregularly or in excess of jurisdiction, and such acts are alleged to have been done maliciously and corruptly. [25 N.J. Misc. at 20].

The United States Supreme Court has also had occasion to consider the concept of judicial immunity, and in the early case of *Bradley v. Fisher*, 80 *U.S.* (13 Wall) 335 (1872), the Court declared that it is a principle of "the highest importance to the proper administration of justice that a judicial officer, in exercising the authority vested in him, shall be free to act upon his own convictions, without apprehension of personal consequence to himself." 80 *U.S.* (13 Wall) at 347. The Court also emphasized that the immunity afforded to judges was firmly established not only in the common law, but in other systems of jurisprudence as well:

> The principle, therefore, which exempts judges of courts of superior or general authority from liability in the exercise of their judicial functions, obtains in all countries where there is any well-ordered system of jurisprudence. It has been the settled doctrine of the English courts for many centuries, and has never been denied, that we are aware of, in the courts of this country.
>
> It has, as Chancellor Kent observes, "a deep root in the common law." [80 *U.S.* (13 Wall) at 347 (citation omitted)].

More recently, in *Pierson v. Ray*, 386 U.S. 547 (1967), the Court reiterated the historic nature of the privilege by observing that "[f]ew doctrines were



more solidly established at common law." 386 *U.S.* at 553-54. The Court, however, emphasized that the privilege is recognized not to protect the corrupt judge, but rather for the benefit of the public in whose interest it is that judges must be free to exercise the functions of their office without fear of the consequences. 386 *U.S.* at 554. *See also McCray v. Maryland*, 456 *F.*2d 1 (4 Cir. 1972).

Although it is clear that the public has a comparable interest in the independence of the prosecutorial function which warrants the extension to them of a limited form of immunity, we decline to characterize prosecutorial immunity as absolute or to equate it with its judicial counterpart. In so doing we are mindful that the courts of other jurisdictions have often compared the official immunity of prosecutors to that enjoyed by judges. *See, e.g., Yasselli v. Goff*, 12 *F.*2d 396, 404 (2 Cir. 1926), aff'd *per curiam*, 275 *U.S.* 503 (1927); *Bethea v. Reid*, 445 *F.*2d 1163, 1166 (3 Cir. 1971), *cert.* den. 404 *U.S.* 1061 (1972); *Bauers v. Heisely*, 361 F.2d 581, 589 (3 Cir. 1966), *cert.* den. 368 U.S. 1021 (1967); *Gabbard v. Rose*, 359 *F.*2d 182, 185 (6 Cir. 1966); *Kenney v. Fox*, 232 *F.*2d 288, 290 (6 Cir. 1956), *cert.* den. 356 *U.S.* 856 (1956); *Lundblade v. Doyle*, 379 *F. Supp.* 57, 60 (N.D. Ill. 1974). In our view, however, there are persuasive reasons for not equating the two forms of immunity.

We are also satisfied that the case law of this State is consistent with our conclusion that the two forms of immunity are not identical. Although the issue of prosecutorial immunity had occasionally been before the lower courts,[3] in *State v. Winne*, 12 *N.J.* 152 (1953), a criminal

3. In *Hann v. Lloyd*, 50 *N.J.L.* 1 (Sup. Ct. 1887), the plaintiff alleged assault, battery and false imprisonment on the part of a sheriff, a constable and a prosecutor of the pleas as a result of the execution of a writ of "compulsory process" to procure plaintiff's presence as a witness in a pending criminal

prosecution for nonfeasance in office, Chief Justice Vanderbilt indicated that the Supreme Court had not yet considered the problem :

> It is to be noted that in some jurisdictions a county prosecutor is not subject to a civil suit for damages at the hands of an aggrieved citizen, though that point has not been passed on here. [12 *N.J.* at 170 (citations omitted)].

Later that same year, this Court decided *Earl v. Winne*, 14 *N.J.* 119 (1935), an action against the Bergen County Prosecutor and two of his detectives. The complaint alleged false arrest and imprisonment, malicious prosecution, malicious abuse of process, and conspiracy arising out of plaintiff's arrest and indictment for criminal libel. The prosecutor defended on the grounds of, among other

trial. In concluding that a jury instruction to find in favor of defendants was proper, the court said:

> Mr. Addison in his work on Torts, section 922, thus states the doctrine of the law on this head: "Generally speaking, however, so long as the process has not been set aside it is a protection to the attorney who has issued it, and to the client by whose commands it has issued. And though when it has been set aside it is no longer a justification to them, yet it always remains a justification to the sheriff and his officers, who had no option but to obey it." Under the circumstances stated, the prosecutor of the pleas, with respect to what he did, was invested with an immunity similar to that which was possessed by the constable and the sheriff. [50 *N.J.L.* at 5].

*See also Edelman v. Dunn*, 107 *N.J.L.* 353 (E. & A. 1931) in which the court held that an action for unlawful detention and imprisonment could not be maintained even in the face of allegations that the assistant prosecutor acted maliciously in refusing to accept bail. The court did not base its conclusion on prosecutorial immunity but rather on the fact that a statute precluded prosecutors from exercising control over bail:

> We therefore conclude that the refusal by a public official to perform an official act for which there is no statutory authority, does not constitute a cause of action, even though his grounds for refusal were improper and he was actuated by a malicious motive, as the legality of an act cannot be changed or affected by the motive for which it is done. [107 *N.J.L.* at 354].



things, the lack of civil liability on the part of defendants as public officers. 14 *N.J.* at 123-24. In concluding that the prosecutor and his assistants do not enjoy unqualified immunity from civil suit, the Court said:

> The prosecutor of the pleas and his assistants are charged with the obligation to act in due accordance with the law in the discharge of their public duties, particularly by initiating such a proceeding by filing a complaint in a proper manner as established by the prevailing practice. The mere fact that their private rights have been invaded permits no deviation based upon personal predilection or gain. They have the benefit of the presumption that they act legally in the discharge of their public duty, but if the presumption is overcome by convincing proof that they acted in excess of and distinct from their required official duty for personal reasons of their own, then for such acts they are civilly liable. It is only such acts which are redressable in actions for malicious prosecution and malicious abuse of process. [14 *N.J.* at 134].

More recently, in *DeGroot v. Muccio*, 115 *N.J. Super.* 15 (Law Div. 1971), an action alleging wrongful participation in the murder prosecution of plaintiff on the part of, among others, the Passaic County Prosecutor, his assistants and a confidential aide. the trial court refused to dismiss all of the allegations against defendants based on the gravity of the charges. The gist of the complaint accused defendants of knowingly using perjured testimony on the part of two witnesses to implicate plaintiff and to "cover up" mistakes in their investigation. 115 *N.J. Super.* at 18.

Defendants moved for a dismissal of the complaint based on "the rule of judicial immunity and its application covering conduct in the realm of the public prosecution." 115 *N.J. Super.* at 20. After acknowledging that

no case from this Court had explored the problem of extending a judicial-type immunity to defendants, the trial court reviewed the authorities from other jurisdictions and found that "the persistence and durability of the defense is remarkable." 115 *N.J. Super.* at 23. The court, however, found the charges of subornation of perjury in the case before it to be not only "'serious,'" *"horrendous."* 115 *N.J. Super.* at 29 [emphasis in original]. In the court's view the enormity of the allegations made it unnecessary to hold that a prosecutor in New Jersey has a defense to civil suits, or to define the limits of prosecutorial immunity:

> [C]itation of authority is unnecessary for the proposition that conduct such as is alleged in transaction (1) is actionable in tort. No rationalization could possibly shield evil acts of such magnitude. [115 *N.J. Super.* at 29-30.

Thus it is clear that New Jersey case law to date has not equated prosecutorial immunity with its judicial counterpart and reflects the philosophy that there are indeed circumstances in which a prosecutor will incur civil liability for his official conduct. We wish to make it clear that we believe that this is the preferable approach to future problems involving the civil immunity of prosecutors in this State. The public interest is best served by recognizing that prosecutors enjoy only a limited form of immunity.[4]

4. Although this case involves a cause of action which accrued prior to July 1, 1972, it should be noted that the New Jersey Tort Claims Act, *N.J.S.A.* 59:1-1 *et seq.* (Supp. 1974-75) also establishes limits on the immunity which it extends to public employees for injuries caused by the institution or prosecution of judicial or administrative proceedings. *N.J.S.A.* 59:3-8 (Supp. 1974-75) provides that:

> A public employee is not liable for injury caused by his instituting or prosecuting any judicial or administrative proceeding within the scope of his employment.

(*Continued on Page 14a*)



For purposes of this case we need not consider the outer limits of prosecutorial immunity since we wholly agree with the conclusions of the Appellate Division that plaintiffs' allegations do not support any inference that the prosecutor in this case acted out of personal motive, with malicious intent, or in excess of his jurisdiction.

## II

We also agree with the Appellate Division that in the context of this case, the prosecutor and the detectives are to be considered as agents of the State and not the county. *Cashen, supra* at 404-05. We wish to make it clear, however, that our resolution of this issue is limited to the factual circumstances here presented. We find it appropriate to regard the defendant officials as State agents where the alleged tortious conduct arose out of the investigation of criminal activity, but we express no opinion on the question of whether the prosecutor or his detectives

(*Continued From Page 13a*)

The 1972 comment to the above provision makes it clear, however, that there are limits to the immunity granted by the section:

> This provision recognizes an immunity generally followed at common law. See DeGroot v. Muccio, 115 N.J. Super. 15, 277 A.2d 899 (Law Div. 1971); Grove v. Van Duyn, 44 N.J.L. 654, 43 A.R. 412 (E. & A.); Bedrock Foundations, Inc. v. Geo. H. Brewster & Son, Inc., 31 N.J. 124 A.2d 536 (1959). It should be noted that the immunity does not extend to conduct amounting to a crime or constituting actual malice, actual fraud or willful misconduct.

Other sections also emphasize that the immunity granted by the act is not boundless. Section 59:3-14 provides:

> 59:3-14. *Public employee immunity—exception*
>
> a. Nothing in this act shall exonerate a public employee from liability if it is established that his conduct was outside the scope of his employment or constituted a crime, actual fraud, actual malice or willful misconduct.
>
> b. Nothing in this act shall exonerate a public employee from the full measure of recovery applicable to a person in the private sector if it is established that his conduct was outside the scope of his employment or constituted a crime, actual fraud, actual malice or willful misconduct.

can be considered State or county employees for other purposes. *See Cooper v. Imbriani*, 63 N.J. 535 (1973). We also leave for another day the question of whether a county may be held vicariously liable for the conduct of a prosecutor or his detectives in other circumstances.

III

Our primary area of disagreement with the Appellate Division, however, concerns the disclosure of the identity of the "John Doe" informer. The Appellate Division concluded that no valid public purpose was served by withholding the identity of the informer upon which the affidavit was based. *Cashen, supra* at 408.

The Appellate Division recognized that what is often termed the "informer's privilege" is in reality a privilege afforded the government in recognition of the compelling need of the State to protect its sources of information concerning criminal activity. The United States Supreme Court in *Roviaro v. United States*, 353 *U.S.* 53 (1957), observed that the privilege reflects the interest of society in effective law enforcement:

> The purpose of the privilege is the furtherance and protection of the public interest in effective law enforcement. The privilege recognizes the obligation of citizens to communicate their knowledge of the commission of crimes to law-enforcement officials and, by preserving their anonymity, encourages them to perform that obligation. [353 *U.S.* at 59].

The privilege, however, is not unlimited, and in exploring its boundaries in *Roviaro, supra*, the Court observed that the scope of the privilege must be limited by the purposes it serves. One of the limits identified by the



Court is founded upon the "fundamental requirements of fairness." 353 *U.S.* at 60. The Court, however, declined to establish a fixed rule governing disclosure, recognizing that the problem required a balancing of the competing interests involved on a case by case basis:

> We believe that no fixed rule with respect to disclosure is justifiable. The problem is one that calls for balancing the public interest in protecting the flow of information against the individual's right to prepare his defense. Whether a proper balance renders nondisclosure erroneous must depend on the particular circumstances of each case, taking into consideration the crime charged, the possible defenses, the possible significance of the informer's testimony, and other relevant factors. [353 *U.S.* at 62].

We adopted the *Roviaro* approach in *State v. Burnett*, 42 *N.J.* 377 (1964), and our rules of evidence reflect the limitations of fairness upon the privilege.[5] While we are sensitive to the fairness limitation on the scope of the privilege, it is important to emphasize that unwarranted disclosure of government informers poses a very real threat to the continued vitality of the principle. We recognized this danger in *State v. Oliver*, 50 *N.J.* 39 (1967):

> In dealing with the informer privilege, we must be mindful of the ease with which the privilege would

5. *Evid. R.* 36, *N.J.S.A.* 2A:84A-28 provides:

A witness has a privilege to refuse to disclose the identity of a person who has furnished information purporting to disclose a violation of a provision of the laws of this State or of the United States to a representative of the State or the United States or a governmental division thereof, charged with the duty of enforcing that provision, and evidence thereof is inadmissible, unless the judge finds that (a) the identity of the person furnishing the information has already been otherwise disclosed or (b) disclosure of his identity is essential to assure a fair determination of the issues.

be destroyed if disclosure were required without a substantial showing of a need for it. [50 *N.J.* at 47].

Although the question is one of first impression in this State, it is now clear that the balancing process set forth in *Roviaro* is applicable to civil as well as criminal cases. *Westinghouse Electric Corp. v. Burlington*, 351 *F.*2d 762 (D.C. Cir. 1965):

> Appellee argues that the *Roviaro* standard would never justify disclosure in civil cases in which the Government is not a party. But the fact that the case is civil rather than criminal is not dispositive. * * * The policies behind the privilege and its exceptions extended to civil as well as criminal cases. Presumably most informers do not want their names to be revealed in either a civil or criminal proceeding. The fact that there would be a somewhat greater chance, statistically, of having their identity revealed if disclosure is required in civil cases would be unlikely to deter citizens from informing. There is no logical reason to set up two different privileges, one for civil and one for criminal cases. The defendant in a criminal case may have a greater stake than a party in a civil case, but that would not always be so: even admitting the probability of a greater risk of retaliation in a criminal case. The *Roviaro* balance should be struck in each case, civil and criminal, in deciding whether disclosure "is essential to a fair determination of a cause." [351 *F.*2d at 769 (quoting *Roviaro, supra*)].

*See also Mitchell v. Roma*, 265 *F.*2d 633 (3 Cir. 1959). *See generally* Annotation, "Application in Federal Civil Action, of Governmental Privilege of Nondisclosure of Identity of Informer," 8 *A.L.R. Fed.* 6 (1971) and cases cited therein.



In the present case, the Appellate Division struck the balance in favor of disclosure because in its view the information supplied by the informer was false; thus he could not be considered reliable. As a result, the court found that "[n]o public benefit would be served by continuing his 'informer' services." *Cashen, supra* at 408-09.

While we are satisfied that the Appellate Division correctly identified the balancing test to be applied in cases such as this one, we doubt that either the trial court or the Appellate Division had before it an adequate record to actually perform the delicate and difficult balancing of interests called for. Hence we vacate the order of the Appellate Division directing disclosure of the identity of the informant.

If, on remand, plaintiffs choose to press their motion to compel discovery and either the State or defendants,[6] by a suitable motion for a protective order pursuant to *R.* 4:10-3, resist discovery, the trial court will be required to consider all the facts bearing both on the possible unfairness to plaintiffs of denying disclosure of the identity of the informer and the possible harm which may be inflicted on State interests by disclosure. In evaluating the former, the court should consider, *inter alia*, the nature of the claims asserted by plaintiffs, the actual loss alleged, plaintiffs' reasons for seeking disclosure, and the likelihood that the evidence about or testimony by the informant will be necessary to plaintiffs' case. In evaluating the latter, the court should consider the risk of possible prej-

6. *Evid. R.* 36 gives the "witness," in this case defendants, the right to assert the privilege. Since, however, the privilege exists for the benefit of the State, the State may also assert the privilege on its own behalf. When the State has not been joined as a party defendant, it is appropriate to permit it to intervene for the limited purpose of seeking a protective order against disclosure of the identity of an informer. *Cf. O'Keefe v. Boeing Co.*, 38 *F.R.D.* 329 (S.D. N.Y. 1965).

udice to pending or future prosecutions as well as the danger that the informant may be exposed to physical harm, harassment, or other untoward consequences. It is proper for the court to give less weight to the interests of plaintiff if it appears that he has suffered only insubstantial damages. The risk of loss to plaintiffs resulting from the nondisclosure of the informant may be pure conjecture. *See Black v. Sheraton Corp. of America*, 47 *F.D.R.* 263 (D. D.C. 1969). We wish to emphasize that in civil cases in which disclosure is sought not to aid in the defense of criminal charges, but for the purpose of asserting claims for money damages, the interests of the State in maintaining the confidentiality of the informer's identity are entitled to a greater degree of respect.

The reliability of the informant or lack thereof, upon which the Appellate Division placed principal emphasis, may be relevant to the prejudice which the State will suffer by the disclosure of his identity and, thus, is a factor to be considered. Nevertheless, the mere fact that the informant has given erroneous information on one occasion is, of course, not necessarily dispositive of his over-all reliability as an informant (although it may have some bearing on the seriousness of the claim advanced by plaintiffs). As the Appellate Division properly observed, "not every misstatement or inaccuracy by an informer will necessarily result in the scales balancing towards a divulging of his identity." 125 *N.J. Super.* at 410. It should be noted that in this case, while it is agreed that the affidavit was erroneous, it has not yet been established that the information provided by the informant was erroneous.

While our discussion thus far recognizes the often vital law enforcement services which are performed by informers, it would be naive to suppose that the privilege of nondisclosure of confidential sources of information may



not be the source of potential abuse. In the context of the present case, one such possibility is the naked assertion by the State that no facts bearing on the interests of the government in maintaining the confidentiality of he informer can be disclosed because the facts themselves are confidential in nature. The motive for such an assertion in response to claims for damages for a mistaken search and seizure is obvious. Equally apparent is the difficult nature of plaintiff's task in proving his case if no facts bearing on the informer's activities, or existence, are disclosed.

In our view, basic considerations of fairness which ultimately circumscribe the informer's privilege, require that in civil cases, when disclosure of a confidential informer's identity is vital to a party's case, the respective interests must be balanced as contemplated by *Roviaro, supra, Burnett, supra,* and *Oliver, supra,* and a decision reached as to anonymity or disclosure. Such considerations may require that the identity of the informant be disclosed to a party in a civil suit under some circumstances. Nevertheless, this is a step to be taken with caution and only with full appreciation of all the consequences.

The judgment of the Appellate Division is affirmed as modified.

Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
MAY 29 1975
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

# Supreme Court of the United States

DOCKET NO. 74-1421

PAUL CASHEN and IRENE CASHEN,

*Petitioners,*

*vs.*

FRANK SPANN, ROBERT BICKLEY, CHARLES M. EGAN, JR., JOHN DUNNE, individually and as servant, agent or employee of CHARLES EGAN, JR., "JOHN DOE," being a fictitious name of the "Reliable Informer," NEW JERSEY BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY, ANTHONY DE BIASI, THE COUNTY OF MORRIS and the BOROUGH OF WHARTON,

*Respondents.*

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

## ADDITIONAL APPENDIX TO WRIT OF CERTIORARI

ACCARDI & KOCH,
*Attorneys for Petitioners,*
Nine Clinton Street,
Newark, New Jersey 07102

JOSEPH S. ACCARDI
*On the Petition*

N. J. Appellate Printing Co., Inc., Woodbridge, N. J. (201) 636-2030

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendix C

Opinion of Superior Court of New Jersey, Appellate Division, Docket No. A-2976-71 ..... 1a

## Appendix C

## Opinion of Superior Court of New Jersey Appellate Division Docket No. A-2976-71

Argued: April 9,1973—Decided: November 2, 1973.

Before Judges Fritz, Lynch and Trautwein.

On appeal from the Superior Court, Law Division, Essex County.

Mr. Joseph S. Accardi argued the cause for appellants (Messrs. Accardi & Koch, attorneys; Mr. Conrad N. Koch on the brief; Mr. Joseph S. Accardi on the supplemental brief).

Mr. William T. McElroy argued the cause for respondents Spann, Bickley, Egan, Dunne, DiBiasi and the County of Morris (Messrs. Hughes, McElroy, Connell, Foley & Geiser, attorneys; Mr. Edward B. Deutsch on the briefs).

Mr. Joseph A. Hoffman argued the cause for respondent New Jersey Bell Telephone Company.

No one appeared in behalf of respondent "John Doe."

The opinion of the court was delivered by LYNCH, J.A.D.

On June 19, 1970, detectives of the Morris County Prosecutor's Office and police of the Borough of Wharton, armed with a search warrant and seeking evidence of bookmaking and lottery, broke into the home of plaintiffs. As we now know the raid was a bizarre mistake. Plaintiffs, a relatively elderly retired couple, were completely innocent of any wrongdoing, and utterly without connection with gambling or other illegal activity of any kind.

By an amended complaint plaintiffs sued Prosecutor Egan, detectives Bickley, Spann, Dunne and DeBiasi, one "John Doe," being a fictitious name of a "reliable informer" (who allegedly gave information that plaintiff Ralph Cashen was involved in gambling activities), the New Jersey Bell Telephone Company (Telephone Company), the County of Morris (County) and the Borough of Wharton (Borough). The amended complaint against the County, defendant officials and Telephone Company, charged false arrest and imprisonment, libel and slander, invasion of privacy and assault and battery. It also charged that the Telephone Company, through its employees, negligently and wantonly supplied false information to the Prosecutor's detectives with respect to telephone calls made to plaintiff Paul Cashen.[1]

The answers of defendant Prosecutor, detectives, and the County, among other things, set up the defenses of immunity and failure of plaintiffs to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. Those defendants moved for summary judgment in their favor under, as they stated, "the doctrine of judicial immunity and its application covering conduct in the realm of the public prosecutor." Defendant Telephone Company also moved for summary judgment, claiming that it acted in the premises in compliance with subpoena and other lawful orders of the Prosecutor and hence was cloaked with the same immunity as the Prosecutor. The Company also claimed that provisions of the Communications Act of 1934, §605 as amended, 47 U.S.C. §605 (1968), absolved it from liability. The trial court granted summary judgment in favor of all defendants. Plaintiffs appeal from said judgment except, as said above, no appeal has been taken from the summary

1. Since no appeal has been taken against the Borough, we need not recount the charges against it



judgment which had earlier been granted in favor of the Borough.

Plaintiffs also claim that the error of the trial court in granting summary judgment to defendants subsumed the court's further error in refusing to compel defendants to disclose the identity of the so-called "reliable informer" referred to in the affidavit of defendant Bickley which was the basis upon which the search warrant was issued.

The basic reasoning of the trial judge in granting summary judgment in favor of defendant Prosecutor and detectives was that since, in his view, there was no showing of malice on their part or that they acted for "personal reasons of their own or distinct from their required duty," they were immune from suit. Since the County of Morris was sued on the theory that such officials were its agents, the County was likewise absolved.

As to defendant Telephone Company, the court held there was no liability because it acted pursuant to subpoena and, under the decisions in *United States v. Covello*, 410 F.2d 536 (2d Cir. 1969) and *Nolan v. United States*, 423 F.2d 1031 (10th Cir. 1969), and 47 U.S.C.A. §605, the Company was not liable.

In ruling that plaintiffs were not entitled to disclosure of the identity of the "reliable informer," the trial court held that the policy considerations which dictate nondisclosure of such information in criminal cases, expounded in *State v. Burnett*, 42 N.J. 377 (1963), and other cases, are likewise controlling in this civil case and preclude such disclosure.

The affidavit upon which the issuance of the search warrant was based was sworn to by defendant Bickley. It read, so far as here pertinent, as follows:

On Monday, June 15, 1970, Det. Spann checked with the N.J. Bell Telephone Company as to phone calls made from 335-6508 and 539-6548, and it was learned from the Telephone Company that numerous calls were made to the residence at 9 Crater Avenue in Wharton, N.J., telephone number 366-3115 and telephone number 328-5364, and also telephone number 743-1133 in Bloomfield, New Jersey. A further check with the N.J. Bell Telephone Company revealed that the telephone number 366-3115, is listed to one Paul Cashen, 9 Crater Avenue, Wharton, New Jersey; telephone number 328-5634 is listed to the U.S. Government, Picatinny Arsenal, Dover, N.J., Building 94 QAD and in control of Paul Cashen; and telephone number 743-1133 is listed to one, Lamont Curran, 29 Washington Road, Bloomfield, New Jersey. Inv. Bickley called a person at Picatinny Arsenal who has given reliable information relative to gambling activities there and was advised by this informant that one, Paul Cashen, employed at Picatinny Arsenal, was accepting horse bets and number bets from fellow employees at the Arsenal, and that at least twice a day would call from one or two pay phones in Building 94 to someone with these bets. He also stated that he would keep notations in a small black notebook which he kept constantly on her person to record said bets.

On Monday, June 15, 1970, a further inquiry was made with the Telephone Company, and it was learned from this that numerous phone calls were made from the Raymond Dragos residence to Paul Cashen, to Bloomfield and numerous phone calls from John Peragallo's residence to Paul Cashen, to Bloomfield.

Telephone number 335-6508 was listed to Mrs. Virginia Peragallo, wife of John Peragallo, otherwise identified in the affidavit as being engaged in taking horse and number bets. Telephone number 539-6548 was listed to Raymond Dragos, also identified in Bickley's affidavit as engaging in taking of such bets. Concededly the information contained in Bickley's affidavit was false in the following respects: (1) no phone calls were ever made to Cashen's home by Peragallo or Dragos; (2) telephone number 328-5634 at Building 94 QAD at Picatinny Arsenal was not in control of Paul Cashen at the time involved. Cashen had worked at Picatinny Arsenal for 33 years but had retired on October 31, 1969 and had been at the Arsenal on only one day since then, in January 1970, as he drove through the Arsenal grounds to go fishing; (3) the information allegedly given to Bickley that (a) Cashen was accepting horse and number bets at Picatinny, and (b) at least twice a day called from one or two pay phones in Building 94 with the bets, was false; (4) the information allegedly given by a representative of the Telephone Company that numerous phone calls were made to Cashen from the residence of Dragos and Peragallo was also false.



Detective Spann testified on deposition that on June 15, 1970 he called the Morristown Office of the Telephone Company and was told that calls were being made to Cashen's home from those of bookmakers Peragallo and Dragos. Spann further testified that he normally dealt with a Mrs. DiFiore at the Morristown Office but that she was not working on June 15, 1970, and he did not know the identity of the telephone representative who gave him the information. On the other hand, Mrs. DiFiore testified on deposition that she worked at the Boonton Office and not at Morristown, as Spann said. But she did testify that on June 15 and 16, 1970, she was called at the Boonton Office and advised Spann that there was no information relative to the investigation for that day. She specifically said she never gave the Prosecutor's office

any information as to Cashen's telephone number. There was also testimony that calls from Dragos to Cashen would not be toll calls, and therefore there would be no record of them. And Peragallo's phone would not be serviced by either the Morristown or Boonton office but by the Dover Office. In fact, Mrs. DeFiore testified she was never asked to give any information relative to the Peragallo phone.

Against this factual background we must determine the propriety of (a) the summary judgment in favor of defendants, and (b) the order denying plaintiff's request that the identity of the "reliable informer" be disclosed by first resolving these issues: (I) Are defendant Prosecutor and his detectives cloaked with immunity from suit? (a) If there is immunity, what is its nature, respectively as to each such defendants and what, if any, are its limitations as to each? (b) If there is immunity but it is not absolute, are there any genuine issues of material fact which preclude granting of summary judgment to defendants? *R.*4:67-5. (II) Were the Prosecutor and his detectives agents of the County in doing what they did? (III) What, if any, is the liability of the Telephone Company in the premises, and (IV) Should defendants, under the circumstances of this case, be compelled to disclose the identity of the so-called "reliable informer"?

## I

## IMMUNITY OF DEFENDANT OFFICIALS

It appears that the trial court applied the same standard of immunity as to all official defendants and the County, *i.e.*, that they are not liable in the absence of any showing of "malice" or that they acted "for personal reasons of their own." In this uniformity of treatment the court erred.



Defendant Prosecutor was cloaked with the same immunity as possessed by a judge. A judge is not civilly liable for acts done which are at least colorably within his jurisdiction. *Grove v. Van Duyn,* 44 N.J.L. 654 (E. & A. 1882). Such judicial immunity has been recognized for centuries. *Bradley v. Fisher,* 80 U.S. (13 Wall.) 335 (1882). That case explained the reason for the existence of such immunity as follows:

> For it is a general principle of the highest importance to the proper administration of justice that a judicial officer, in exercising the authority vested in him, shall be free to act upon his own convictions, without apprehension of personal consequence to himself. Liability to answer to everyone who might feel himself aggrieved by the action of the judge, would be inconsistent with the possession of this freedom, and would destroy that independence without which no judiciary can be either respectable or useful. As observed by a distinguished English judge, it would establish the weakness of judicial authority in a degrading responsibility. *Taaffe v. Downes,* 3 Moore, P.C., 41 n. [*Id.* at 347].

So it has been held that a prosecutor was immune to suit for false imprisonment alleged to have resulted from an arrest of plaintiff pursuant to a writ which the prosecutor delivered to a constable for execution. *Hann v. Lloyd,* 50 N.J.L. 1 (Sup. Ct. 1887). There it was said the prosecutor "acted within his official province in instructing the officer as to his official duty with respect to it." *Id.* at 5. See also *Edelman v. Dunn,* 8 Misc. 154 (Sup. Ct. 1930). The reasons why a prosecutor is clothed with "judicial immunity" were well stated in *Bauers v. Heisel,* 361 F.2d 581, 589 (3d Cir. 1966):

In deciding the question of whether a prosecuting attorney is liable for acts done in his official capacity, we must decide whether his duties are sufficiently judicial as to cloak him with the same immunity afforded judges or are so closely related to those duties of law enforcement officials as to amerce him with potential civil liability for his imprudent actions. See *Monroe v. Pape*, 365 U.S. 167, 81 St. Ct. 473, 5 L.Ed. 492 (1961); Comment, 18 Ark. L. Rev. 81, 84-92 (1964). Analogy could support either conclusion, but we believe that both reason and precedent require that a prosecuting attorney should be granted the same immunity as is afforded members of the judiciary. The reasons are clear: his primary responsibility is essentially judicial—the prosecution of the guilty and the protection of the innocent, *Griffin v. United States*, 295 F. 437, 439-440 (C.A. 3, 1924); his office is vested with a vast quantum of discretion which is necessary for the vindication of the public interest. In this respect, it is imperative that he enjoy the same freedom and independence of action as that which is accorded members of the bench.[9] This reasoning is nearly as well established in Anglo-American law as judicial immunity itself. *Yaselli v. Goff*, 12 F.2d 396 (C.A. 2, 1926), aff'd, per curiam "on the authority of *Bradley v. Fisher* ° ° ° [and] *Alzua v. Johnson*, 231 U.S. 106, 111 [34 S. Ct. 27, 58 L. Ed. 142]," 275 U.S. 503, 48 S. Ct. 155, 72 L.Ed. 395 (1927), and numerous cases and authorities cited therein. Prosecuting attorneys who have been sued under the Civil Rights Act, R.S. §1979, have likewise been held immune. *Laughlin v. Rosenman*, 82 U.S. App. D.C. 164, 163 F.2d 838 (1947); *Kenney v. Fox, supra,* and other cases cited in note 7, *supra.*



And see extensive collection of cases in *Bauers'* n. 7 at 586, wherein prosecuting attorneys were held immune. See also *Belthea v. Reid,* 445 F.2d 1163 (3d Cir. 1971), *cert. den.* 404 U.S. 1061 (1972).

In *State v. Winne,* 12 N.J. 152 (1953), Chief Justice Vanderbilt stated that in some jurisdictions a county prosecutor is not subject to a civil suit for damages at the hands of an aggrieved citizen, but he observed: "° ° ° though that point has not been passed on here ° ° °." *Id.* at 170. The Chief Justice apparently meant that the question had not been passed on by the Supreme Court created by the 1947 Constitution, for he made no mention of *Hann v. Lloyd, supra,* or *Edelman v. Dunn, supra,* opinions of the former Supreme Court. However, in the same opinion he stated that the "° ° ° kind of discretion required of the county prosecutor is not different from that required of a judge ° ° °." *Id.* at 174.

In the later case of *Earl v. Winne,* 14 N.J. 119 (1953), both *Hann v. Lloyd* and *Edelman v. Dunn* were mentioned in the following context:

> The general rule is that an action will not lie against a judicial officer for an error in judgment, however prejudicial to the rights of a party such error may be. *Taylor v. Doremus,* 16 N.J.L. 473 (Sup. Ct. 1838); *O'Regan v. Schermerhorn, supra.* So it has been held in *Nann [sic] v. Lloyd,* 50 N.J.L. 1 (Sup. Ct. 1887), that a prosecutor of the pleas had the same immunity as a sheriff and his officers in executing process that on its face appeared to have been regularly issued by a court having jurisdiction of the subject matter. Again in *Edelman v. Dunn, supra,* it was held that an assistant prosecutor could not be liable for an error in judgment made in the course of his duty in relation to an arraignment and fixing of bail. [*Id.* at 132].

*Earl v. Winne, supra,* laid down the following outline of a prosecutor's immunity:

> The prosecutor of the pleas and his assistants are charged with the obligation to act in due accordance with the law in the discharge of their public duties, particularly by initiating such a proceeding by filing a complaint in a proper manner as established by the prevailing practice. The mere fact that their private rights have been invaded permits no deviation based upon personal predilection or gain. They have the benefit of the presumption that they act legally in the discharge of their public duty, but if the presumption is overcome by convincing proof that they acted in excess of and distinct from their required official duty for personal reasons of their own, then for such acts they are civilly liable. It is only such acts which are redressable in actions for malicious prosecution and malicious abuse of process. [*Id.* at 134.]

The trial court herein applied that rule to defendant prosecutor and, finding that there was no evidence that he acted for "personal reasons" of his own, entered summary judgment in his favor. We agree and affirm as to that defendant. In doing so we are not unmindful of the decision in *DeGroot v. Muccio,* 115 N.J. Super. 15 (Law Div. 1971). We are not here called upon to approve, or disapprove, the result, or the opinion, in that case. The acts charged against defendant prosecutor here in no sense approach the "ultimate peak of wickedness" or the "horrendous" charges there made. We do note that in *DeGroot, Hann v. Lloyd, supra,* was not cited. Suffice it to say that the actions of the prosecutor here—insofar as he "acted" at all, since there was no proof of his personal participation or motivation here-in—were clearly within his jurisdiction and no excess thereof is suggested. Therefore his "judicial" immunity is preserved. See *Restatement of Torts,* §656 (1938), 1 Harper and James, *The Law of Torts,* §4.3 (1956).



So far as appears, defendant DiBiasi merely executed the warrant of the court. Appellants point to no evidence that he acted with personal motives of his own, that he did not act in necessary compliance with a warrant issued by a court of competent jurisdiction and in good faith reliance thereon, or that he was in fact guilty of any charges in the complaint. A governmental agent cannot be made responsible in a judicial tribunal for obeying the lawful command of the government and a public agent who acts pursuant to the command of a legal precept can justify his act by the production of that precept. *Den ex dem. Murray v. Hoboken Land and Imp. Co.,* 59 U.S. (18 How.) 272 (1956). The language in *Hann v. Lloyd, supra,* is appropriate:

> The result, therefore, is that we have a writ, duly authenticated, coming from a court of general jurisdiction, that was vested with cognizance over the class of cases to which it appertained, placed in the hands of the proper officials for execution. It is the legal rule that under such conditions the judicial precept must be implicitly obeyed by those to whom it is thus directed. This is a principle essential to the orderly administration of the law. And the consequence is that the officers to whom the writ is addressed will not be responsible for anything necessarily or properly done in its execution. Such ministers of the law need not show the grounds on which the tribunal in issuing the process proceeded, for they can rely on the writ alone without the production of the judgment record on which it is presumed to rest. It is not necessary to refer to books in support of a doctrine that no one

> will controvert. Plainly, the judge was right in holding that the writ was a complete vindication of the conduct of these ministerial officers for their arrest and detention of the plaintiff. [*Id.* at 4].

Additionally, there is no evidence that DiBiasi acted in excess of his authority under the warrant. There thus being no demonstration of a genuine issue of material fact, we affirm the summary judgment in his favor.

However, unlike DiBiasi, defendants Bickley, Spann and Dunne did not act merely in obedience to the warrant issued by the court. The alleged actions of those defendants which are brought into question occurred before the warrant issued. Bickley made the affidavit which contained the false information. Allegedly, Spann gave false information which was contained in the affidavit and which he said he obtained from the Telephone Company. And, according to Bickley, Dunne participated in the drafting of the affidavit.

Bickley, Spann and Dunne acted essentially as police officers. The common law never granted police officers an absolute or unqualified immunity. *Pierson v. Rey,* 386 U.S. 547 (1967). See also *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bur. of Narc.*, 456 F.2d 1339, 1346 (2d Cir. 1972) (on remand from United States Supreme Court 403 U.S. 388 (1971)). In *Bivens*, Judge Medina stated the reasons why immunity should not be extended to federal officers:

> Thus, the real question to be asked is whether or not federal officers performing police duties warrant the protection of the immunity defense. We hold that they do not.
>
> This policy decision has been expressed by courts in terms of "discretion"—making an arrest is not



> deemed to be a discretionary function. See *e.g., Carter v. Carlson,* 144 U.S. App. D.C. 388, 447 F.2d 358 (1971), *cert. granted sub nom. District of Columbia v. Carter,* 404 U.S. 1014, 92 S. Ct. 683, 30 L.Ed 2d 661 (Jan. 10, 1972); *Sherbutte v. Marine City,* 374 Mich. 48, 130 N.W.2d 920 (1964); Jaffe, Suits against Governments and Officers: Damage Actions, 77 Harv. L. Rev. 209, 218-19 (1963). "The tendency to hold a public official accountable appears to increase as the discretionary scope of his duties decrease. Hence, police officials, whose job is to enforce the law, are not given immunity." Note, Immunity of Prosecuting Officials from Suit for Alleged Deprivation of Civil Rights, 40 Temp. L.Q. 244, 250 (1967). Mr. Justice Harlan used similar reasoning in Barr, where he said that "the broader the range of responsibilities and duties, ° ° ° the wider the scope of discretion ° ° °." 360 U.S. at 573, 79 S. Ct. at 1340. Whereas it is true that a police officer must exercise some discretion in making an arrest, the fiction that this act is not discretionary is maintained because of the belief that the benefit to society derived from the protection of personal liberties outweighs the detriment of perhaps deterring vigorous police action. See Developments in the Law—Remedies Against the United States and its Officials, 70 Harv. L. Rev. 827, 835 (1957). Consequently, "[t]he common law has never granted police officers an absolute and unqualified immunity ° ° °." *Pierson v. Ray,* 386 U.S. 547, 555, 87 S. Ct. 1213, 1218, 18 L.Ed.2d 288 (1967). See also K. Davis, Administrative Law Treatise §26.03 at 874-5 (Supp. 1970).

In *Jones v. Perrigan,* 459 F.2d 81 (6th Cir. 1972), plaintiff was arrested by Perrigan, an F.B.I. agent, pursuant

to arrest warrants allegedly procured by Perrigan by execution of perjured affidavits in support thereof. Jones sued Perrigan for false imprisonment and malicious prosecution. The District Court dismissed the complaint, holding that Perrigan, as a public officer, was immune from liability. The Court of Appeals, by a divided court, reversed, citing *Bivens* and said on its own behalf:

> We disagree with the basis of the decision of the District Court. As a matter of public policy, certain officials are absolutely immune from liability for acts committed within the scope of their office, even if the acts were corrupt or malicious. [Citing cases]. The immunity of law enforcement officers from false arrest liability is a qualified one, in the nature of an affirmative defense. Immunity is available only if the officer acted in good faith with probable cause. [Citing cases]. "This immunity of officers cannot fairly be enlarged without jeopardizing the privacy or security of the citizen." [Citing cases]. The mere fact that Perrigan was an FBI agent does not per se establish his immunity from the claim of Jones. *Fine v. Paramount Pictures, Inc.*, 171 F.2d 571, 574 (7th Cir. 1948). [*Id.* at 83].

New Jersey has adopted the ministerial-discretionary dichotomy as a means of limiting the potential liability of governmental officials acting within the scope of their authority. Where the officials act in a ministerial fashion, immunity will not be available. *Kisielewski v. State of New Jersey*, 68 N. J. Super. 258 (App. Div.), *cert. den.* 36 N.J. 144 (1961); *Czyzewski v. Schwartz*, 110 N.J. Super. 255 (App. Div. 1970). See also *Bedrock Foundations, Inc. v. Geo. H. Brewster & Sons, Inc.*, 31 N.J. 124 (1959). Where, however, the official acts in a discretionary fashion, immunity will be present unless ill will or bad



faith be shown. In *Bivens*, Judge Medina, in examining the case before him in light of the "discretionary" standard, said:

> It would be a sorry state of affairs if an officer had the "discretion" to enter a dwelling at 6:30 A.M. without a warrant or probable cause, and make an arrest by employing unreasonable force [at 1346].

While in the case before us the officers did obtain a warrant, it would be an equally "sorry state of affairs" to hold that officers had the "discretion" to obtain that warrant, as plaintiffs allege, upon a false affidavit or by supplying false information which was used in it. In any event, even if Bickley's, Spann's, or Dunne's actions are deemed "discretionary," there is still left the issue as to whether they acted from ill will, bad faith or malice.

Clearly, if plaintiffs' allegations are true, they have a cause of action for violation of their rights guaranteed to them under the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution. *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of the Fed. Bur. of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971). We agree with the philosophy expressed in *Cohen v. Norris*, 300 F.2d 24 (9th Cir., *en banc*, 1962), that it would be ludicrous for plaintiffs to have an actionable claim for an unconstitutional violation of their rights and for police officers to be immune from suit for having committed the violation.

As has been seen, Bickley's affidavit was concededly false. In *Earl v. Winne, supra*, it was said at 133:

> But where the affiant falsely and maliciously states facts untruly and procures a warrant to be issued he becomes responsible for the prosecution and arrest,

> because if he had not made the false affidavit and asked for the issuing of the warrant, the court could not and would not have decided that criminal process should issue. *Malice and want of probable cause are thus inferred from the falsity of the affidavit* upon which the arrest was procured. *Navarino v. Dudrap*, 66 N.J.L. 620 (E. & A. 1901). [Emphasis added].[2]

So too, the false information which Spann allegedly gave to Bickley and which he said had been obtained from the Telephone Company raises genuine issues of material fact as to whether he acted in good faith or maliciously. However, by posing these issues we are not to be understood as suggesting that either Bickley, Spann or Dunne in fact acted other than in good faith. We hold only that there are genuine issues of material fact which preclude entry of summary judgment in their favor. *R.*4:67-5. And this is especially so where the issues remaining relate to "subjective" elements such as good faith and malice. *Judson v. Peoples Bank & Trust Co. of Westfield*, 17 N.J. 67, 76 (1954). As also said there as to granting summary judgment: "Indeed, subjective elements aside, a note of caution has been sounded as to any case where the opposing party must prove his claim *** from what he can draw from the other party." That is plaintiffs' task here. Summary judgment in favor of defendants Bickley, Spann and Dunne is reversed and a plenary trial is ordered as to them. We repeat for the sake of emphasis, however, that we are not passing on the question as to whether, at such trial, the proofs will establish the traditional elements of the several causes of action alleged by plaintiffs or whether valid defenses will be established on defendants' part.

2. The "malice" here spoken of is *implied* malice as distinguished from the *express* malice which a plaintiff in a libel or slander suit must establish to overcome a qualified privilege. See Point III, *infra*.



## II.

## AS TO THE COUNTY OF MORRIS

The theory upon which plaintiffs assert liability on the part of the County of Morris is that the Prosecutor and his aides were acting in this instance as agents of the County which was therefore vicariously liable on principles of *respondeat superior*. The short answer—though the question was not discussed in any of the briefs—is that the Prosecutor and his aides were not agents of the County, but rather of the State in their actions with respect to the plaintiffs. See Atty. Gen. P.M. 1953, No. 27. The County Prosecutor is a constitutional officer appointed by the Governor, with the advice and consent of the Senate. *N.J. Const.* Art. VII, §2, ¶ 1. The relevant statute provides that: "The criminal business *of the State* shall be prosecuted by the Attorney General and the County Prosecutors." *N.J.S.A.* 2A:158-4 (emphasis added). The County Prosecutor represents the State. *State v. Longo*, 136 N.J.L. 589 (E. & A. 1947). And ultimately when an indictment is found, the prosecution thereof is undertaken by the State of New Jersey in its own name. Therefore, in performing the actions with which they are charged, the Prosecutor and his aides were the agents of the State and not of the County of Morris, and there is no liability as to the County for those actions under the doctrine of *respondeat superior*. Thus we do not reach the question of any immunity which the County may have had at the time of the action sued upon. We also leave for an appropriate case the question of whether the County may be vicariously liable for the actions of detectives in other circumstances.

The summary judgment in favor of the County of Morris is affirmed.

III.

AS TO THE TELEPHONE COMPANY

The amended complaint alleges that the Telephone Company "wrongfully, negligently and unlawfully told the defendant Frank Spann that calls were being made from the telephone which were [*sic*] allegedly being used for the commission of crime to the telephone of the plaintiffs. The New Jersey Bell Telephone Company know [*sic*] or should have known that this information was false. The complaint further alleged that the said false information was "negligently, recklessly, maliciously and wantonly supplied by the defendant New Jersey Bell Telephone Company to the defendant Frank Spann***." In essence, it is a charge of a malicious slander on the part of the Company through its "representative."

It is the Telephone Company's contention that, since any information supplied to detective Spann was given subject to subpoena, it is cloaked with the same immunity as possessed by the Prosecutor. It further argues that it is immune to suit by reason of Section 605 of the Federal Communication Act of 1934, 47 U.S.C.A. §605. We consider these contentions in inverse order.

The latter argument is stated in the Company's brief as follows: "It has been established that the making of toll records by telephone equipment used in the ordinary course of company business does not constitute an unlawful interception and their divulgence to appropriate law enforcement authorities upon subpoena is both legal and proper." In support thereof, the Company cites *United States v. Covello, supra*, 410 F.2d 536 (2d Cir. 1969), and *Nolan v. United States, supra*, 423 F.2d 1031 (10th Cir. 1969). *Covello* and *Nolan*, so far as relevant at all, stand only for the proposition that toll records are admissible in a criminal trial and their divulgence therein to law enforcement authorities is not an impermissible interception under Section 605 of the Federal Communications Act. It does not follow from the correct argument of the Company that it was "proper" to make toll records and not impermissible to divulge the information to the Prosecutor's detectives, that the Company is absolved by statute from all liability.



There is no authority for the proposition that the Telephone Company is cloaked with the same immunity as the Prosecutor merely because it acted pursuant to subpoena. Parenthetically, we note Spann testified that his information that the Cashens' telephone was being used for gambling activity came from a telephone conversation with a representative of the Company. It is not claimed that the information came from any records produced pursuant to subpoena. However, we do hold that the Telephone Company was cloaked with a qualified privilege with respect to whatever communications its "representative" may have given a law enforcement officer such as Spann. A communication, made *bona fide*, on any subject-matter in which the party communicating has an interest, or in reference to which he has a duty, is privilege, if made to a person having a corresponding interest or duty, though the communication would be actionable if it were not for the privilege. *Coleman v. Newark Morning Ledger Co.*, 29 N.J. 357, 375 (1959); *Jorgensen v. Pennsylvania R.R. Co.*, 25 N.J. 541, 543 (1958); *King v. Paterson*, 49 N.J.L. 419, 430 (E. & A. 1887). The purpose of establishing such privilege is for the welfare of society and *** it is 'in the public interest that persons should be allowed to speak freely on occasions when it is their duty to speak, and to tell all they know or believe, or on occasions when it is necessary to speak in protection of some [self or] common interest'; ***." *Coleman v.*

*Newark Morning Ledger Co., supra* at 377. It is indeed in the public interest that a telephone company supplying information to prosecuting authorities in the aid and detection of crime should have such a privilege.

A qualified privilege may be overcome only if there is a showing of express or, as it is sometimes called, actual malice. *Coleman, supra* at 374-375. Such malice is to be distinguished from that *implied* malice which may be inferred from the falsity of Bickley's affidavit (if it was false), as pointed out in *Earl v. Winne, supra*, 14 N.J. at 133 (See Point I above). No such inference of *express* or *actual* malice can be drawn from the mere fact that the libelous or slanderous words were false. Odgers, *The Digest of the Law of Libel and Slander*, 293 (6th ed. 1929). As said in *Gately on Libel and Slander*, 567 (5th ed. 1960):

> *Privileged occasion.* Where the words were published on a privileged occasion, the mere proof that they are false is not evidence of malice. "Even though the statement should be untrue in fact, the defendant will be held justified by the occasion unless it can be shown to have proceeded from a malicious mind." "Mere falsehood is certainly no disproof of bona fides."

Express malice, with which we are now concerned, means something more than the "fictitious legal malice" *(Coleman, supra*, at 375), which is implied from an unprivileged defamation. It must encompass a purpose to make the publication, not primarily for the purpose for which the privilege is bestowed, but for some wrongful motive such as ill will or to accomplish an objective not within the purpose of the privilege. *Id.* And, when the occasion is privileged, as we hold here, the onus lies on plaintiffs to prove defendant's malice, for the *bona fides*



of the defendant is always presumed. Odgers, *op. cit.*, p. 284, and *Coleman* at 373. On such privileged occasion, in what may be termed obeisance to the privilege, it will be assumed that defendant published the defamatory matter honestly believing it to be true, unless there is some evidence from which a contrary inference may be drawn. Gately, *op. cit.*, §§480, 481, pp. 271-272. It is plaintiffs' burden to produce such evidence. If indeed the evidence is merely equivocal, *i.e.*, equally consistent with malice or *bona fides*, or if the evidence is a mere scintilla, the judge should stop the case. Odgers, *op. cit.* pp. 284-285. As the latter authority puts it:

> "If once the privilege be established, unless there be extrinsic evidence of malice, there must be something so extreme in the words used as to rebut the presumption of innocence, and to afford evidence that there was a wrong and an indirect motive prompting the publication" *(per* Buckmaster, L.C., in *Lyal v. Henderson*, [1916] S.C. (H.L.), at p. 175). [at 293].

Assuming that the "representative" of the Telephone Company gave Spann the information which he ascribes to her, we conclude that there is no evidence of express or actual malice on the part of the Company or its "representative." For these reasons the summary judgment in favor of the Telephone Company is affirmed.

## IV

## DISCLOSURE OF THE IDENTITY OF THE INFORMER

Plaintiffs appeal from the action of the trial court in refusing to compel defendant officials to disclose the identity of the so-called reliable informer referred to in Bickley's affidavit. Defendant officials rely on the "informer's

privilege" (*Rules of Evidence,* rule 36; N.J.S. 2A:84A-28), and the philosophy denying disclosure of the informer's identity as expressed in numerous criminal cases. In doing so they cite, among others, *State v. Burnett,* 42 N.J. 377 (1964), and *State v. Petillo,* 61 N.J. 165 (1972), *cert. den.* — U.S. —, 93 S. Ct. 1393, 35 L.Ed 611 (1973).

The privilege relied upon is not the privilege of the informer but the privilege of the Government. The scope of the privilege is limited by its underlying purpose. That purpose is the furtherance and protection of the public interest in effective law enforcement. *Roviaro v. United States,* 353 U.S. 53 (1957). As said in the latter case: "The privilege recognizes the obligation of citizens to communicate their knowledge of the commission of crimes to law-enforcement officials and, by preserving their anonymity, encourages them to perform that obligation." *Id.* at 59. And: "A further limitation on the applicability of the privilege arises from the fundamental requirements of fairness. Where the disclosure of an informer's identity, or of the contents of his communication, is relevant and helpful to the defense of an accused, *or is essential to a fair determination of a cause,* the privilege must give way." (emphasis added). The same limitation to "fairness" on the privilege is incorporated in *Rule of Evidence* 36, N.J.S.A. 2A:84A-28.

No absolute rule can be laid down as to when disclosure of the informer's identity is essential to a fair determination of the issues. What is called for is a balancing of the public interest in protecting the flow of information and the legitimate interests of the informer against the rights of others to a fair determination. *Roviaro,* as adopted in *State v. Burnett, supra.*

Weighing the issue of disclosure here by the foregoing tests, we conclude that no valid public purpose can be



served by withholding disclosure of the identity of the informer upon which Bickley relied in his affidavit. The information, if given at all, was totally false. Therefore the so-called informer cannot be said to be reliable. No public benefit would be served by continuing his "informer" services. If he were to follow the pattern established in this case, he would only mislead the authorities and defeat the public interest. Assuming that he exists and that he did in fact relate to *Spann* the information charged to him, his disservice to law enforcement, whether it be by carelessness, by incompetence, or by intention, is abundantly apparent.

As we have said above, since the affidavit of Bickley contains false information, malice may be inferred therefrom. Such inference may be rebutted on Bickley's part by revelation of the reasons why he relied upon the informer. If indeed the informer cannot be identified then malice on the part of Bickley could readily be found by the jury.

In *Brogan v. The Passaic Daily News,* 22 N.J. 139 (1956), a libel suit wherein defendants pleaded the newspaperman's statutory privilege (then N.J.S. 2A:81-10) and refused to disclose the "reliable source" it had relied on, the Supreme Court said:

> The position of the respondents in this case is that they insist on asserting these defenses based upon the reliability of the source of information upon which they relied, yet refuse to disclose what those sources were, so that the jury could ascertain whether they were in fact reliable. [at 152].

And, at 153:

> When the trial court upheld the claim of privilege by the witness Smith with respect to questions as to the

> identity of the "reliable source" of his information, he foreclosed the plaintiff of obtaining information favorable to its position to combat the defenses of good faith and fair comment and lack of malice raised by the defendants. The cross-examination of a party witness on matters directly in issue and directly relevant to the issue is a matter of right.

It was held that the privilege had been waived. See also *Beecroft v. Point Pleasant Print. & Pub. Co.*, 82 N.J. Super. 269 (Law Div. 1964).

So here, defendant Bickley asserts that he had a "reliable informer" and he will undoubtedly defend on the ground that he had probable cause to make the affidavit and acted in good faith. But by refusing to disclose the identity of the informer he would unfairly deny plaintiffs the right to test those defenses and would preclude them from cross-examining him "on matters directly in issue" which is a "matter of right." To do so is violative of the object of *R. Ev.* 36 which would compel disclosure "to assure a fair determination of the issues."

It is important that we note emphatically that not every misstatement or inaccuracy by an informer will necessarily result in the scales balancing toward a divulging of his identity. As with many situations where important public considerations are involved, in the sensitive and delicate area of a balancing of public and individual rights, determination should be made on the basis of the facts in the particular area. In each case, "We must assay the fairness of nondisclosure in the context in which it arises ***" (*Burnett, supra* 42 N.J. at 386), both legally and factually.

Defendant officials further support their contentions on this subject by arguing that the attempt of plaintiffs to dis-



cover the identity of the informer is essentially an attack upon the truthfulness of Bickley's affidavit and such an attack is precluded by the opinion in *State v. Petillo, supra.* True, *where the issue is whether an affidavit submitted in support of an application for a search warrant* supplies sufficient probable cause for the issuance of that warrant, an attack upon the truthfulness asserted in the affidavit is precluded by *Petillo.* As Justice Francis said in that case:

> The standard provided in the Constitutions as the basis for intrusion into the home of a citizen because of alleged gambling activities is not proof of his guilt of the criminal offense. The requirement is sworn statements of fact of sufficient legal quality to persuade an impartial judge that probable cause exists to believe that the crime described is being committed at the place. Once that test is met to the satisfaction of the judge, relitigation of the truth of the factual basis for *issuance* of the warrant should not be permitted. [61 N.J. at 174].

But most pertinent to the issue in this civil case where defendant Bickley is charged with making a false affidavit, Justice Francis expressly excluded application of his decision to a case such as this when he said: "Further, so far as the untruthful officers are concerned, they expose themselves to the sanctions of indictment for perjury or false swearing, a charge of criminal contempt, *and assessment of monetary damages in a civil action.*" *Id.* 174; emphasis added. And again he expressly said, after laying down the rule as to testing the veracity of an affidavit if it be sufficient on its face *for the issuance of a warrant:* "We think such a rule adequately serves the purpose of the Fourth Amendment, and that sufficient deterrence to the

ıre false affidavit that may slip by the issuing judge is provided by the sanctions of perjury, contempt and *civil damages.*" *Id.* 178-179; emphasis added.

There is no issue as to the validity of the search warrant here. Attack on the falsity of the affidavit of Bickley is therefore not precluded and plaintiffs are entitled to a trial on the remedy they seek here, *i.e.* recovery of civil damages.

We therefore reverse the order of the trial court in denying disclosure of the identity of the informer referred to in Bickley's affidavit to the end that plaintiffs may be assured a fair determination of the issues, including that as to the falsity of the affidavit, the motivation therefor, and the good faith or malice of the maker.

## CONCLUSION

In summary, the summary judgment granted in favor of defendants Prosecutor Egan, DeBiasi, County of Morris, and the Telephone Company, is affirmed. The summary judgment granted in favor of defendants Bickley, Spann, and Dunne, is reversed. The order denying plaintiffs information as to the identity of the informer referred to in Bickley's affidavit is reversed and such disclosure is to be made.

No costs to any party.

A true copy

/s/ Mortimer G. Newman, Jr.
MORTIMER G. NEWMAN, JR.
Clerk

Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
JUL 15 1975
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

# Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1975

**No. 74-1421**

PAUL CASHEN and IRENE CASHEN,
*Petitioners,*

*vs.*

FRANK SPANN, ROBERT BICKLEY, CHARLES M. EGAN, JR., JOHN DUNNE, individually and as servant, agent or employee of CHARLES EGAN, JR., "JOHN DOE," being a fictitious name of the "Reliable Informer," NEW JERSEY BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY, ANTHONY DI BIASI, THE COUNTY OF MORRIS, THE BOROUGH OF WHARTON and THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
*Respondents.*

**On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey**

## BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

WILLIAM F. HYLAND,
Attorney General of New Jersey,
*Attorney for Respondents, The State of New Jersey,*
State House Annex,
Trenton, New Jersey 08625.

DAVID S. BAIME,
Deputy Attorney General,
Division of Criminal Justice,
Appellate Section,
7 Glenwood Avenue,
East Orange, New Jersey 07017,
*Of Counsel.*

STEVEN LEONARD STRELITZ,
Deputy Attorney General,
Division of Criminal Justice,
*On the Brief.*

Adams Press Corp., 11 Commerce Street, Newark, N. J. 07102—(201) 623-8611

## TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | PAGE |
|---|---|
| COUNTER-STATEMENT OF MATTER INVOLVED | 2 |
| POINT I—Petitioner's claim that he has been deprived of his rights under the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Amendments to the United States Constitution, is premature in view of the State Supreme Court's order remanding the matter for further fact finding | 6 |
| Finality | 6 |
| Ripeness | 9 |
| POINT II—Nondisclosure of an informer's identity in a civil suit does not deprive petitioner of due process of law under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution | 12 |
| POINT III—Petitioner's request that this Court determine the specific standard to be utilized in considering whether to disclose an informer's identity in a civil proceeding, does not raise a substantial constitutional question | 14 |
| CONCLUSION | 16 |


### Cases Cited


Ashwander v. Tennessee Valley Authority, 297 U. S. 288 (1936) ..... 10, 11

Black v. Sheraton Corp. of America, 47 F.R.D. 263 (D. D. C. 1969) ..... 13, 14

Bocchicchio v. Curtis Publishing Co., 203 F. Supp. 403 (D. C. Pa. 1962) ..... 13, 14

PAGE

Boyle v. Landry, 401 U. S. 77 (1971) ..... 10

Brady v. Maryland, 373 U. S. 83 (1963) ..... 9

Clark v. Willard, 292 U. S. 112 (1934) ..... 8

Cleary v. Bolger, 371 U. S. 392 (1963) ..... 11

Commonwealth of Massachusetts v. Mellon, 262 U. S. 447 (1923) ..... 10

Consejo Gen. De Estud Etc. v. University of Puerto Rico, 325 F. Supp. 453 (D. P. R. 1971) ..... 11

Cotton v. Hawaii, 211 U. S. 162 (1908) ..... 8

Department of Banking v. Pink, 317 U. S. 264 (1942) ..... 8

Fairchild v. Hughes, 258 U. S. 126 (1922) ..... 10

Federation of Labor v. McAdory, 325 U. S. 450 (1944) ..... 10

Flast v. Cohen, 392 U. S. 83 (1966) ..... 9, 10

Golden v. Zwickler, 394 U. S. 103 (1968) ..... 11

Gospel Army v. Los Angeles, 331 U. S. 543 (1948) .... 8

Henrik v. Mannerfrid, 23 F.R.D. 173 (D. C. N. Y. 1959) ..... 12

Hudson Distributors Inc. v. Eli Lilly Co., 377 U. S. 386 (1964) ..... 9

International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union v. Boyd, 347 U. S. 222 (1954) ..... 10

Local No. 438 Const. and General Laborers Union v. Curry, 371 U. S. 542 (1963) ..... 9

Market Street R. Co. v. Railroad Commission, 324 U. S. 548 (1945) ..... 7



PAGE

McInes v. United States, 62 F. 2d 180 (9 Cir. 1932), cert. den. 288 U. S. 616 (1933) ..... 12

Mercantile National Bank v. Langdeau, 371 U. S. 555 (1963) ..... 9

Muskrat v. United States, 219 U. S. 346 (1911) ..... 10

North Dakota St. Bd. of Pharmacy v. Snyder's Drug Stores, Inc., —— U. S. ——, 94 S. Ct. 407 (1973) ..... 7, 8

Pichler v. Jennings, 347 F. Supp. 1061 (S. D. N. Y. 1972) ..... 11

Poe v. Ullman, 367 U. S. 497 (1961) ..... 10, 11

Radio Station WOW v. Johnson, 326 U. S. 120 (1945) ..... 7

Republic Natural Gas Co. v. Oklahoma, 334 U. S. 62 (1948) ..... 7

Richfield Oil Corp. v. State Board, 329 U. S. 69 (1946) ..... 8

Roviaro v. United States, 353 U. S. 53 (1957) .... 6, 12, 13, 15

State of New Jersey v. Sargent, 269 U. S. 328 (1925) 10

Timkin Roller Bearing v. U. S., 38 F.R.D. 57 (D. C. Ohio 1964) ..... 13

United States v. Freuhauf, 365 U. S. 146 (1961) ..... 10

Westinghouse Electric Corp. v. Burlington, 351 F. 2d 762 (D. C. Cir. 1965) ..... 13, 14

Wheeler v. Barrera, —— U. S. ——, 94 S. Ct. 2274 (1974) ..... 11

Wirtz v. Continental Finance and Loan Co., 326 F. 2d 561 (5 Cir. 1964) ..... 13

PAGE

**United States Constitution Cited**

Article III, Section II ..... 9
Fourth Amendment ..... 6
Fifth Amendment ..... 6
Sixth Amendment ..... 6
Fourteenth Amendment ..... 12

**Statute Cited**

28 U.S.C.:
Sec. 1257(3) ..... 6, 9

**Rule Cited**

Rule 40-3 ..... 2

**Other Authorities Cited**

Annotation:
"Application, in Federal Civil Action, of Governmental Privilege of Nondisclosure of Informer," 8 A.L.R. Fed. 6 (1971) ..... 13

Stern and Gressman, Supreme Court Practice (4th Ed. 1969):
96-100 ..... 8, 9

8 Wigmore Evidence (McNaughton rev. 1961):
p. 761, Sec. 2374 ..... 13, 14

Wright, Federal Courts (2d Ed. 1963):
34 ..... 9, 10

IN THE

# Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1975

**No. 74-1421**

PAUL CASHEN and IRENE CASHEN,
*Petitioners,*

*vs.*

FRANK SPANN, ROBERT BICKLEY, CHARLES M. EGAN, JR., JOHN DUNNE, individually and as servant, agent or employee of CHARLES EGAN, JR., "JOHN DOE," being a fictitious name of the "Reliable Informer," NEW JERSEY BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY, ANTHONY DI BIASI, THE COUNTY OF MORRIS, THE BOROUGH OF WHARTON and THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
*Respondents.*

**On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey**

## BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

## Counter-Statement of Matter Involved

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 40-3, Respondent, State of New Jersey respectfully submits the following additions and corrections to Petitioner's Statement of the Matter Involved.

This matter involves a civil suit arising out of the investigation of gambling activities in Morris County and the execution of a search warrant at the residence of the plaintiffs Paul and Irene Cashen. The investigations primarily concerned four individuals, Raymond Dragos, Johnny Gallo, a/k/a John Peragallo, Stanley Mosher and Thomas O'Mara, who were as a direct result of the investigation arrested, indicted and, subsequently, pled guilty to various charges of illegal gambling.

On June 18, 1970, County Investigator Robert Bickley executed and presented an affidavit in support of search warrant to the Honorable Jacques H. Gascoyne, J.C.C., which described in detail some results of that investigation (See App. Div. Pa4 to Pa23).* According to the affidavit, as a part of that investigation a check was made of telephone records for the Log Cabin Tavern, site of extensive gambling activities. Detective Spann learned of numerous calls to the Cashen residence and to a number listed to the U.S. Government, Picatinny Arsenal, which was allegedly in the control of Paul Cashen. Investigator Bickley obtained corroboration from a person at Picatinny Arsenal who had previously given reliable information relative to gambling activities. He learned that Paul Cashen was accepting horse and numbers bets (App.Div. Pa18 to Pa19). Subsequently, additional information was obtained from the telephone company of calls from Dragos and Peragallo to Paul Cashen. Judge

* Pa refers to the appendix of petitioner's brief filed in the Superior Court, Appellate Division.



Gascoyne issued the warrant, which was executed on June 19, 1970 by County Detective Anthony DiBiasi and other members of the prosecutor's staff with the assistance of the Borough of Wharton Police Department (See App. Div. Pa1 to Pa3). The ensuing search failed to uncover any evidence of gambling.

The plaintiffs commenced a law suit on May 19, 1971 in the Superior Court, Law Division, Essex County (venue was subsequently transferred to Morris County) against Morris County Prosecutor Charles Egan, Jr. and members of his staff, Detectives Frank Spann, John Dunne and Anthony DiBiasi and Investigator Robert Bickley, and against the County of Morris, the Borough of Wharton, the New Jersey Bell Telephone Company and "Joe Doe," being the name of a "reliable informer." An amended complaint filed on December 2, 1971 was grounded in theories of negligence, as well as intentional acts of wrongdoing including false arrest and imprisonment, slander, libel and assault.

As part of discovery, written interrogatories were propounded on Investigator Robert Bickley and Detective Frank Spann. On advice of counsel these defendants refused to answer questions regarding the "reliable informer." On May 12, 1972 the trial court denied plaintiffs' motion for more specific answers (App.Div. Pa42, Pa43). The court also granted summary judgment in favor of the Borough of Wharton. On June 9, 1972 a hearing was held on motions for summary judgment presented by the remaining defendants, and on July 5, 1972 the court entered an order granting summary judgment to all remaining defendants (App.Div. Pa50, Pa51). Notice of Appeal from the latter order was filed on July 12, 1972 (App.Div. Pa52, Pa53). No appeal was taken from the summary judgment in favor of the Borough of Wharton.

On November 2, 1973 the Appellate Division rendered their decision affirming summary judgment in favor of defendants Prosecutor Egan, Detectives DiBiasi, County of Morris, and the New Jersey Bell Telephone Company, and reversing summary judgment in favor of Investigator Bickley and Detectives Spann and Dunne. The reviewing court also ordered disclosure of the informer's identity referred to in defendant Bickley's affidavit.

After the decision of the Appellate Division, the County of Morris and its insurer, the Fireman's Fund American Insurance Company, which represented defendants-petitioners in the Law and Appellate Divisions, declined to continue representation. At the request of the Morris County Prosecutor the Division of Criminal Justice filed a Notice of Petition for Certification on November 26, 1973, to preserve the rights of the defendants-petitioners pending the resolution of the question of liability of the County of Morris to represent them. The defendants-petitioners brought an action for declaratory judgment in the Superior Court, Chancery Division, Morris County, and on January 16, 1974, that court ordered the County of Morris to provide Bickley, Spann and Dunne with representation. Notice of Appeal was filed on February 1, 1974.

On January 16, 1974 defendants-petitioners filed an amended Notice and a Petition for Certification. On January 22, 1974, plaintiffs-respondents filed a letter in lieu of brief advising the New Jersey Supreme Court that they would rely upon their Appellate Division briefs and appendix.

On January 28, 1974 the State of New Jersey requested permission to intervene and file a petition for certification and supplemental brief in the matter. This motion was granted on February 26, 1974.



The New Jersey Supreme Court subsequently held, *inter alia*, that:

> "In our view, basic considerations of fairness which ultimately circumscribe the informer's privilege require that in civil cases, when disclosure of a confidential informer's identity is vital to a party's case, the respective interests must be balanced as contemplated by *Roviaro*, [353 U.S. 53 (1957)], *Burnett*, [42 N.J. 377, 201 A.2d 39 (1964)], *Oliver*, [50 N.J. 39, 231 A.2d 805 (1967)], and a decision reached as to anonymity or disclosure. Such considerations may require that the identity of the informant be disclosed to a party in a civil suit under some circumstances. Nevertheless, this is a step to be taken with caution and with full appreciation of all the consequences." 66 N.J. 541, 557, —— A.2d ——, ——.

On the basis of the foregoing, the Supreme Court vacated the order of the Appellate Division directing disclosure of the informer's identity and remanded the matter for further proceedings consistent with its opinion. Specifically, the Court concluded:

> "While we are satisfied that the Appellate Division correctly identified the balancing test to be applied in cases such as this one, we doubt that either the trial court or the Appellate Division had before it an adequate record to actually perform the delicate and difficult balancing of interests called for. Hence we vacate the order of the Appellate Division directing disclosure of the identity of the informant." 66 N.J. 541, 555, —— A.2d ——.

Thereafter, on May 13, 1975, appellant's Petition for Writ of Certiorari in the above-entitled matter was docketed in the Supreme Court of the United States. Subsequent thereto, on May 28, 1975, the Honorable William J. Brennan, Jr. denied petitioner's application for a stay.

## POINT I

**Petitioner's claim that he has been deprived of his rights under the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Amendments to the United States Constitution, is premature in view of the State Supreme Court's order remanding the matter for further fact finding.***

### Finality

Before proceeding to a formal discussion of the ripeness issue, it is necessary to consider the question of whether the present case satisfies the finality requirement embodied in 28 U.S.C. §1257(3). While petitioner seeks to invoke this Court's jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. 1257 (3), Respondent respectfully submits that the interlocutory nature of the present case nullifies any assertion of finality and thus eliminates the jurisdictional basis on which the present petition is premised.

---

* In Point One of his brief, Petitioner asks this Court to decide, "whether an informer is entitled to immunity from suit, based upon the privilege of nondisclosure granted to the government, when the information given by the informer is demonstrably false, malicious, libelous and defamatory?" Since these allegations clearly represent factors to be considered in the overall balancing test enunciated in *Roviaro* v. *United States,* 353 U.S. 53 (1957) and since the New Jersey Supreme Court remanded the instant matter for additional fact finding in order to reach an equitable balance, Respondent respectfully submits that Point I of Petitioner's brief is manifestly premature.



In general, it may be said that a state court judgment must be final in two respects to fall within the purview of the Supreme Court's appellate jurisdiction. "It must be subject to no further review or correction in any other state tribunal; it must also be final as an effective determination of the litigation and not of merely interlocutory or intermediate steps therein. It must be the final word of a final court." *Market Street R.Co.* v. *Railroad Commission,* 324 U.S. 548, 551 (1945).

In summarizing the requirement of finality, Mr. Justice Frankfurter, writing for the Court in *Radio Station WOW* v. *Johnson,* 326 U.S. 120, 124 (1945), stated:

> "This requirement has the support of considerations generally applicable to good judicial administration. It avoids the mischief of economic waste and of defrayed justice. Only in a very few situations, where intermediate rulings may carry serious public consequences, has there been a departure from this requirement of finality for federal appellate jurisdiction. The prerequisite to review derives added force when the jurisdiction of this Court is invoked to upset the decision of a State Court. Here we are in the realm of potential conflict between the courts of two different governments. And so, ever since 1789, Congress has granted this Court the power to intervene in State litigation only after 'the highest Court of a State in which a decision in the suit could be had' has rendered a 'final judgment or decree.' This requirement is not one of those technicalities to be easily scorned. It is an important factor in the smooth working of our federal system."

See also, *Republic Natural Gas Co.* v. *Oklahoma,* 334 U.S. 62, 67-69 (1948); *cf. North Dakota St. Bd. of Pharmacy*

v. *Snyder's Drug Stores, Inc.*, —— U.S. ——, 94 S.Ct. 407 (1973). Justice Frankfurter, however, additionally noted that this concept of "finality" has a "penumbral area" which precludes a purely mechanical application of the rule. Thus, while he held that Nebraska's ruling on the legality of a radio license issued by the federal commission could be reviewed even though the state court had not yet determined the final accounting, he added that ". . . where the remaining litigation may raise other federal questions that may later come here . . . to allow review of an intermediate adjudication would offend the decisive objection to fragmentary reviews." *Id.* at 127.

Therefore, the question evolves into what factors will be relevant to a resolution of the jurisdictional issue of finality. To this end, it has been variously stated that the Supreme Court will examine ". . . both the judgment and the opinion as well as other circumstances [including State law] which may be pertinent" to a resolution of the finality issue. *Gospel Army* v. *Los Angeles*, 331 U.S. 543, 548 (1948). However, in the final analysis ". . . the test is not whether under local rules of practice the judgment is denominated final . . . but rather whether the record shows that the order of the appellate court has in fact fully adjudicated rights and that that adjudication is not subject to further review by a State court." *Department of Banking* v. *Pink*, 317 U.S. 264, 268 (1942); *cf., Richfield Oil Corp.* v. *State Board*, 329 U.S. 69, 72 (1946); *Cotton* v. *Hawaii*, 211 U.S. 162, 170-171 (1908). In conjunction with the foregoing approach, the Supreme Court has considered as final, a State court determination which conclusively disposes of a matter *distinct and separate* from the general subject of the litigation. *Clark* v. *Willard*, 292 U.S. 112, 117-119 (1934); See also, *Stern and Gressman, Supreme Court Practice*



96-100 (4th Ed. 1969). Moreover, in a number of cases decided since 1963 the Court has expanded its conception of what is separate and independent for purposes of the finality doctrine. *Mercantile National Bank* v. *Langdeau*, 371 U.S. 555, 557-558 (1963); *Local No. 438 Const. and General Laborers Union* v. *Curry*, 371 U.S. 542 (1963); *Hudson Distributors Inc.* v. *Eli Lilly Co.*, 377 U.S. 386 (1964); *Brady* v. *Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963). However, subject to the expansionist trend exhibited in the post-1963 vintage cases, wherein the Court considered such factors as national policy, distinctness of issues, and potential of irreparable injury, respondent respectfully submits that if a judgment contemplates further discretionary action on remand, it is not final and cannot be reviewed by the Supreme Court.

Since the present case falls squarely within the latter category, does not contravene any of the policy considerations espoused in the post-1963 cases, and represents a classic example of an interlocutory appeal contemplating further discretionary State action, it is submitted that Petitioner has not complied with the finality requirement underlying 28 U.S.C. §1257(3). Thus, the jurisdictional prerequisite to the granting of a Writ of Certiorari has not been satisfied.

**Ripeness**

Furthermore, and of equal importance, is the fact that the present case is patently premature. It is an unassailable tenet of our judicial system that Courts cannot render judgments on federal constitutional questions unless presented in the form of a "case or controversy." United States Constitution, Article III, Section II; *Flast* v. *Cohen*, 392 U.S. 83, 95-98 (1966); *C. Wright, Federal*

*Courts* 34 (2d Ed. 1963). Embodied in the phrase "case or controversy" is a limitation on the business of the federal courts which confines their authority to deciding "questions presented in an adversary context and in a form capable of resolution through judicial process." *Flast* v. *Cohen, supra* at 95; see also, *United States* v. *Freuhauf,* 365 U.S. 146, 157 (1961); *Federation of Labor* v. *McAdory,* 325 U.S. 450, 461 (1944); *Muskrat* v. *United States,* 219 U.S. 346 (1911). Whether grounded in constitutional principle, see *e.g., Commonwealth of Massachusetts* v. *Mellon,* 262 U.S. 447 (1923); *Fairchild* v. *Hughes,* 258 U.S. 126 (1922), or viewed as a mere policy limitation, see *Ashwander* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority,* 297 U.S. 288 (1936), federal courts have consistently avoided passing prematurely on questions of constitutional magnitude. Judicial authority may only be invoked when the interests of litigants require protection against actual interference. A hypothetical threat is not enough. Thus, the related doctrines of "standing", "ripeness", and "mootness" which have evolved over the years are incidents of the primary conception that federal judicial power is to be exercised "only at the instance of one who is himself immediately harmed, or immediately threatened with harm, by the challenged action." *Poe* v. *Ullman,* 367 U.S. 497, 504 (1961); *International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union* v. *Boyd,* 347 U.S. 222 (1954); see also, *Boyle* v. *Landry,* 401 U.S. 77 (1971); *State of New Jersey* v. *Sargent,* 269 U.S. 328 (1925); *Ashwander* v. *T.V.A., supra* at 483. As noted by Mr. Justice Brandeis in his concurring opinion in *Ashwander*:

> "The Court will not 'anticipate a question of constitutional law in advance of the necessity of deciding it.' 'It is not the habit of the court to decide questions of a constitutional nature unless absolutely necessary to a decision of the case.'" (citations omitted) 297 U.S. at 483.



Accord, *Wheeler* v. *Barrera,* —— U.S. ——, 94 S.Ct. 2274, 2287 (1974); *Golden* v. *Zwickler,* 394 U.S. 103, 108 (1968); *Pichler* v. *Jennings,* 347 F.Supp. 1061, 1064-1066 (S.D. N.Y. 1972); *Consejo Gen. De Estud Etc.* v. *University of Puerto Rico,* 325 F.Supp. 453, 456 (D.P.R. 1971). The same rule obtains whether the litigation concerns a challenge to the validity of a statute or the claimed denial of a constitutional right. *Poe* v. *Ullman, supra* at 503-504; *Ashwander* v. *T.V.A., supra* at 483; *cf. Cleary* v. *Bolger,* 371 U.S. 392, 402 (1963) (Goldberg, J., concurring).

In the instant matter, petitioners have requested this court to anticipate a question of constitutional magnitude which can best be described as manifestly premature. In this regard, the following excerpt from the State Supreme Court decision in the above-entitled matter is particularly instructive, if not dispositive:

> "While we are satisfied that the Appellate Division correctly identified the balancing test to be applied in cases such as this one, we doubt that either the trial court or the Appellate Division had before it an adequate record to actually perform the delicate and difficult balancing of interests called for. Hence we vacate the order of the Appellate Division directing disclosure of the identity of the informant.
>
> If, on remand, plaintiffs choose to press their motion to compel discovery and either the State or defendants, by a suitable motion for a protective order pursuant to R. 4:10-3, resist discovery, the trial court will be required to consider all the facts

bearing both on the possible unfairness to plaintiffs of denying disclosure of the identity of the informer and the possible harm which may be inflicted on State interests by disclosure." *Cashen* v. *Spann, supra* at 66 N.J. 541, 555.

Since the foregoing language provides petitioner with a clear alternative to a constitutional disposition of the instant matter and since this Court has exhibited an historic aversion to resolving constitutional issues in advance of an obvious necessity, the State respectfully submits that *certiorari* be denied.

## POINT II

**Nondisclosure of an informer's identity in a civil suit does not deprive petitioner of due process of law under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.**

Petitioner contends that nondisclosure of an informer's identity in a civil case constitutes a denial of due process of law. The State respectfully submits that this contention is patently frivolous.

Although historically the government's privilege against disclosing the identity of informers had been absolute or quasi-absolute,* recent authority establishes that it is a qualified privilege, subject to certain exceptions. Thus, in the leading decision on the informer's privilege, *Roviaro* v. *United States,* 353 U.S. 53 (1957), it is stated:

---

* See, *e.g., McInes* v. *United States,* 62 F.2d 180 (9 Cir. 1932), *cert.* den. 288 U.S. 616 (1933); *Henrik* v. *Mannerfrid,* 23 F.R.D. 173 (D.C. N.Y. 1959).



"We believe no fixed rule with respect to disclosure is justifiable. The problem is one that calls for balancing the public interest in protecting the flow of information against the individual's right to prepare his defense. Whether a proper balance renders nondisclosure erroneous must depend on the particular circumstances of each case, taking into consideration the crime charged, the possible defenses, the possible significance of the informer's testimony, and other relevant factors." 353 U.S. at 62.

In *Roviaro,* the defendant sought disclosure of the identity of the informant in connection with the issue of guilt. In reversing the ruling of the trial court permitting the Government to withhold the informer's identity, the Court held that where disclosure of the informer's identity, or of the contents of his communication, is relevant and helpful to the defense of an accused, or is essential to a fair determination of a cause, the privilege must give way.

While *Roviaro* involved disclosure of an informant in a criminal proceeding, the Court's rationale has been universally interpreted to apply with equal force and effect in a civil proceeding. *Westinghouse Electric Corp.* v. *Burlington,* 351 F.2d 762 (D.C. Cir. 1965); *Black* v. *Sheraton Corp. of America,* 47 F.R.D. 263 (D.D.C. 1969); *Wirtz* v. *Continental Finance and Loan Co.,* 326 F.2d 561 (5 Cir. 1964); *Timkin Roller Bearing* v. *U.S.,* 38 F.R.D. 57 (D.C. Ohio 1964); *Bocchicchio* v. *Curtis Publishing Co.,* 203 F.Supp. 403 (D.C. Pa. 1962). See, generally, Anno, "Application, in Federal Civil Action, of Governmental Privilege of Nondisclosure of Informer," 8 A.L.R. Fed. 6 (1971); 8 Wigmore Evidence (McNaughton rev. 1961),

§2374 at 761. Thus, petitioner's general assertion that nondisclosure of an informer's identity in a civil case constitutes a violation of due process under the Fourteenth Amendment is conspicuously without merit.

Furthermore, if defendant's suggestion were adopted, it would establish a precedent devastating to the continued viability of the informer's privilege. This conclusion arises from the fact that any individual, including a criminal defendant, could then obtain disclosure merely by instituting a civil suit and seeking discovery. Thus, the impact of such a ruling would be the effective abrogation, albeit indirectly, of the informer's privilege.

## POINT III

**Petitioner's request that this Court determine the specific standard to be utilized in considering whether to disclose an informer's identity in a civil proceeding, does not raise a substantial constitutional question.**

Petitioner submits that there is a split of authority concerning disclosure of an informer's identity in the context of a civil proceeding. On the one hand, he cites *Black* v. *Sheraton Corporation of America, supra,* and *Bocchicchio* v. *Curtis Publishing Co., supra,* for the proposition that the standard for disclosure in civil actions is more stringent than in a criminal proceeding. On the other hand, he cites *Westinghouse Electric Corp.* v. *City of Burlington, supra,* as support for the proposition that the standard for disclosure is the same in both civil and criminal cases.

What petitioner fails to consider, however, is that the constitutional standard for resolving the question of disclosure has already been formulated. In *Roviaro* v. *United States, supra,* this Court specifically stated:



> "We believe that no fixed rule with respect to disclosure is justifiable. The problem is one that calls for balancing the public interest in protecting the flow of information against the individuals right to prepare his defense."* *Id.* at 62.

Clearly, the court was indicating that the constitutional requisite governing disclosure of an informer's identity is the utilization of a balancing test. However, rather than delineating every conceivable factor which might be weighed, the court stated:

> "Whether a proper balance renders nondisclosure erroneous must depend on the particular circumstances of each case, taking into consideration the crime charged, the possible defenses, the possible significance of the informer's testimony, and other relevant factors." *Id.* at 62.

Thus, a particular judge is free to consider the totality of the circumstances in an attempt to reach an equitable balance. Accordingly, the decision to grant one factor more weight than another appears to fall exclusively within the purview of judicial discretion and should not be reversed absent a clear showing of abuse.

Since the case *sub judice* has been remanded for further fact finding and since the New Jersey Supreme Court specifically adopted the test announced in *Roviaro,* respondent respectfully submits that the instant petition fails to raise a substantial federal question.

---

* See Point II, supra, for a discussion of *Roviaro's* general application to civil proceedings.

## CONCLUSION

**For all the foregoing reasons, respondent, State of New Jersey respectfully prays that the writ of certiorari sought in the above named petition pending before this Court not issue.**

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM F. HYLAND
Attorney General of New Jersey
*Attorney for Respondent, The State of New Jersey*
State House Annex
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

DAVID S. BAIME
Deputy Attorney General
Division of Criminal Justice
*Of Counsel*

STEVEN LEONARD STRELITZ
Deputy Attorney General
Division of Criminal Justice
*On the Brief*

Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
JUL 10 1975
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

# Supreme Court of the United States

**No. 74-1421**

PAUL CASHEN and IRENE CASHEN,

*Petitioners,*

*vs.*

FRANK SPANN, ROBERT BICKLEY, CHARLES M. EGAN, JR., JOHN DUNNE, individually and as servant, agent or employee of CHARLES EGAN, JR., "JOHN DOE," being a fictitious name of the "Reliable Informer," NEW JERSEY BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY, ANTHONY DE BIASI, THE COUNTY OF MORRIS and the BOROUGH OF WHARTON,

*Respondents.*

**On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey**

## BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

McElroy, Connell, Foley & Geiser
*Attorneys for Respondents, County of Morris, Charles M. Egan, Jr. and Anthony De Biasi*
161 Madison Avenue
Morristown, New Jersey 07960

George W. Connell
*of Counsel*

Edward B. Deutsch
*On the Brief*

Adams Press Corp., 11 Commerce Street, Newark, N. J. 07102—(201) 623-8611

## TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | PAGE |
|---|---|
| COUNTER-STATEMENT OF FACTS | 1 |
| REASONS WHY THE WRIT SHOULD BE DENIED | 1 |
| POINT I—Since the Supreme Court of New Jersey did not rule that disclosure of an informer's identity could not be had in a civil case, this petition is untimely as premature | 2 |
| POINT II—Until the courts of New Jersey decide unequivocally whether or not the identity of the informant in the instant case should be revealed, the petitioners are without standing to allege a denial of due process | 4 |
| POINT III—Although there may exist two judicial viewpoints vis-á-vis disclosure of an informant's identity in a civil case, neither approach supports the position the petitioners would like this court to take, thus making it unnecessary for this court to decide the issue before it | 5 |
| CONCLUSION | 7 |


### Cases Cited


| | |
|---|---|
| Cashen v. County of Morris, 66 N. J. 541 (1975) | 2, 3, 4 |
| McCray v. Illinois, 386 U. S. 300 (1967) | 5 |
| Roviaro v. United States, 353 U. S. 53 (1957) | 3, 5, 7 |
| State v. Burnett, 42 N. J. 377 (1963) | 3 |
| State v. Oliver, 50 N. J. 39 (1967) | 3 |


### Statute Cited


| | |
|---|---|
| 8 A.L.R. Fed. 6 (1971) | 6 |


### Rule Cited


| | |
|---|---|
| Rule 40 | 1 |

IN THE

# Supreme Court of the United States

**No. 74-1421**

PAUL CASHEN and IRENE CASHEN,

*Petitioners,*

*vs.*

FRANK SPANN, ROBERT BICKLEY, CHARLES M. EGAN, JR., JOHN DUNNE, individually and as servant, agent or employee of CHARLES EGAN, JR., "JOHN DOE," being a fictitious name of the "Reliable Informer," NEW JERSEY BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY, ANTHONY DE BIASI, THE COUNTY OF MORRIS and the BOROUGH OF WHARTON,

*Respondents.*

**On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey**

## BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

### Counter-Statement of Facts

Pursuant to Rule 40, these Respondents will omit a complete counterstatement of fact but do take issue with

certain statements of the Petitioners. Initially, it is clear from the record that these Respondents did not break into the home of the Petitioners but rather carried out a search of the Petitioners' home, car and person only after the issuance of a search warrant by the Honorable Jacques Gascoyne, J.C.C., following a finding by His Honor of probable cause for same. It has nowhere been admitted that the issuance or the basis of the issuance of that warrant was "a bizarre mistake" (Pb3), and it has never been admitted nor proven, as acknowledged by Justice Pashman in *Cashen* v. *County of Morris,* 66 N. J. 541, 556 (1975), "that the information provided by the informant was erroneous." The balance of the statement of facts is largely correct, except that the alleged concessions of these Respondents as stated in Page 6 of Petitioners' Brief have never been made, and the bases of the opinions of the appellate court and the state supreme court are self-explanatory and not limited to the reasons set forth by the Petitioners.

## Reasons Why the Writ Should Be Denied

## POINT I

**Since the Supreme Court of New Jersey did not rule that disclosure of an informer's identity could not be had in a civil case, this petition is untimely as premature.**

The language of the first question presented to this Court by the Petitioners indicates a basic misinterpretation by the Petitioners of the decision rendered in the Supreme Court of New Jersey. The Petitioners view that court's holding as one which



> ". . . gives immunity not only to reliable informers, but also to informers who furnish false and libelous statements to the police under the guise of vital information to combat criminal activities." (Pb10)

This "reason for granting the Writ" (Pb9-10) is a totally incorrect conclusion drawn by the Petitioners. A simple perusal of the unanimous decision appealed from, *Cashen* v. *County of Morris,* 66 N. J. 541 (1975), reveals that no informant, reliable or otherwise, was granted immunity by New Jersey's highest court. In fact, that court recognized that certain circumstances "may require that the identity of the informant be disclosed to a party in a civil suit." 66 N. J. at 557.

As admitted by Petitioners (Pb9), our state supreme court in *State* v. *Burnett,* 42 N. J. 377 (1963) and *State* v. *Oliver,* 50 N. J. 39 (1967), has followed the very balancing test established by the United States Supreme Court in *Roviaro* v. *United States,* 353 U. S. 53 (1957).

It is difficult to understand where there are special and important reasons to grant Certiorari when not only has there been no decision in conflict with existing case law or *dicta* of the United States Supreme Court but, when as here, there is virtually no deviation from the well established "balancing process" of *Roviaro, supra.*

Justice Pashman, writing for the court below simply remanded the matter to the trial level in order to give the Petitioners and the State the necessary opportunity to have an adequate record before the court when the "delicate and difficult" balancing question *is* decided. Justice Pashman stated:

> "While we are satisfied that the Appellate Division correctly identified the balancing test to be

> applied in cases such as this one, we doubt that either the trial court or the Appellate Division has before it an adequate record to actually perform the delicate and difficult balancing of interests called for. Hence we vacate the order of the Appellate Division directing disclosure of the identity of the informant." 66 N. J. at 555.

It becomes readily apparent that the New Jersey supreme court *has not* decided whether or not the identity of the informant should be revealed. The mere fact that the court gave the trial judge certain guidelines with which to perform his function and the Petitioners' case may not squarely fit these guidelines does not give these Petitioners the standing at this juncture to have the Petition for Writ of Certiorari granted. Therefore, without a final adjudication as to whether the identity of the informant should be revealed, this court is without jurisdiction to entertain the Petitioners' claim.

## POINT II

**Until the courts of New Jersey decide unequivocally whether or not the identity of the informant in the instant case should be revealed, the petitioners are without standing to allege a denial of due process.**

The second question presented by Petitioners (Pb2) provides an equally insufficient basis for granting the Writ. Since the New Jersey courts have not made an unequivocal determination vis-á-vis disclosure of the informer's identity in the instant case, there is no room for the Petitioners to alleged a denial of due process. In fact, upon remand the trial court may very well conclude, after employing the guidelines established by the New



Jersey supreme court below, that disclosure is warranted. Thus, until this specific question of disclosure has been judicially settled in the New Jersey courts, the Petitioners are without standing to claim a denial of due process of law.

In any event, it has been well established by this court that the constitutional guarantees of due process and confrontation are not violated by the non-disclosure of an informant where a search warrant has issued through a proper judicial procedure. *McCray* v. *Illinois,* 386 U. S. 300, 312-14 (1967). Such is especially true where the *Roviaro* tests have sufficiently tipped the scales of non-disclosure in favor of the public. *Roviaro, supra* at 60-62. That the instant case concerns a civil, not criminal, matter is of no moment for, even as the Petitioners indicate, no court had advanced a less strict standard for disclosure in a civil case.

## POINT III

**Although there may exist two judicial viewpoints vis-a'-vis disclosure of an informant's identity in a civil case, neither approach supports the position the petitioners would like this court to take, thus making it unnecessary for this court to decide the issue before it.**

The Petitioners assert as their third reason in support of the granting of the Writ that "there is a split of authority in jurisdictions" (Pb12) and that "[t]he United States Supreme Court has never decided the issue of whether the privilege of non-disclosure of the identity of informers is applicable in civil cases . . ." (Pb12). These Respondents find no such split of authority and Justice Pashman aptly resolved this issue by stating:

". . . it is now clear that the balancing process set forth in *Roviaro* is applicable to civil as well as criminal cases. *Westinghouse Electric Corp.* v. *Burlington,* 351 F. 2d 762 (D. C. Cir. 1965):

Appellee argues that the *Roviaro* standard would never justify disclosure in civil cases in which the Government is not a party. But the fact that the case is civil rather than criminal is not dispositive. * * * The policies behind the privilege and its exceptions extended to civil as well as criminal cases. Presumably most informers do not want their names to be revealed in either a civil or criminal proceeding. The fact that there would be a somewhat greater chance, statistically, of having their identity revealed if disclosure is required in civil cases would be unlikely to deter citizens from informing. There is no logical reason to set up two different privileges, one for civil and one for criminal cases. The defendant in a criminal case may have a greater stake than a party in a civil case, but that would not always be so: even admitting the probability of a greater risk of retaliation in a criminal case. The *Roviaro* balance should be struck in each case, civil and criminal, in deciding whether disclosure "is essential to a fair determination of a cause." [351 F. 2d at 769 (quoting *Roviaro, supra*)].

See also *Mitchell* v. *Roma,* 265 F. 2d 633 (3 Cir. 1959). *See generally* Annotation, "Application in Federal Civil Action, of Governmental Privilege of Nondisclosure of Identity of Informer," 8 *A.L.R. Fed.* 6 (1971) and cases cited therein. 66 N. J. at 554.

These Respondents find it difficult to understand what position the Petitioners have taken with regard to this



point. It would appear that the only logical argument in support of their position can be that the *Roviaro* test should *not* be applicable to civil actions. However, such an argument is nowhere advanced. Their position certainly cannot be that the rule in *Roviaro* is applicable, for that is exactly the position of the New Jersey supreme court and thus, there would be no basis for this appeal.

Likewise, it cannot be Petitioners' position that a "stricter rule" than *Roviaro* is applicable since that would be a self-defeating argument.

In any event, the only case law cited by the Petitioners relates to the possible split of opinion as to the applicability of the *Roviaro* test or a stricter standard in civil actions. The foregoing argument cannot logically be the position of the Petitioners and might well be that of the Respondents, and therefore, the fact that there may be a split of opinion or no definitive judgment by the United States Supreme Court as to whether the *Roviaro* or a stricter rule should apply in civil actions is not in issue before this court.

## CONCLUSION

**In conclusion, for the reasons stated above and the fact that the Petitioners have shown no special or important reason whatsoever for the court to grant this Petition for Writ of Certiorari, it is respectfully requested by these Respondents that same should be denied.**

Respectfully submitted,

McElroy, Connell, Foley & Geiser
*Attorneys for Respondents, County of Morris, Charles M. Egan, Jr. and Anthony De Biasi*

George W. Connell
*of Counsel*

Edward B. Deutsch
*On the Brief*

Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
JUL 11 1975
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

# Supreme Court of the United States

**No. 74-1421**

PAUL CASHEN and IRENE CASHEN,

*Petitioners,*

*vs.*

FRANK SPANN, ROBERT BICKLEY, CHARLES M. EGAN, JR., JOHN DUNNE, individually and as servant, agent or employee of CHARLES EGAN, JR., "JOHN DOE," being a fictitious name of the "Reliable Informer," NEW JERSEY BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY, ANTHONY DE BIASI, THE COUNTY OF MORRIS and the BOROUGH OF WHARTON,

*Respondents.*

**On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey**

## BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

STEPHEN S. WEINSTEIN
*Attorney for Respondents, Frank Spann, Robert Bickley and John Dunne*
Twenty Park Place
Morristown, New Jersey 07960

HERBERT M. KORN
*On the Brief*

Adams Press Corp., 11 Commerce Street, Newark, N. J. 07102—(201) 623-8611

## TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | PAGE |
|---|---|
| PROCEDURAL HISTORY | 2 |
| COUNTER-STATEMENT OF FACTS | 3 |
| REASONS FOR DENYING THE WRIT | 4 |
| POINT I—Under 28 U.S.C. §1257 there was no final judgment or decree, therefore, the court should not exercise jurisdiction | 4 |
| POINT II—Jurisdiction should not be exercised inasmuch as the constitutional questions presented are premature and not ripe for decision | 9 |
| CONCLUSION | 12 |


### Cases Cited


| | |
|---|---|
| Alabama State Federation of Labor v. McAdory, 325 U. S. 450, 89 L. Ed. 1725, 65 S. Ct. 1384 (1944) | 7, 9, 10 |
| Ashwander v. Tennessee Valley Authority (Brandeis concurrence), 297 U. S. 288, 80 L. Ed. 688, 56 S. Ct. 466 (1935) | 9-11 |
| Blair v. United States, 250 U. S. 273, 63 L. Ed. 979, 39 S. Ct. 468 (1919) | 10 |
| Golden v. Zwickler, 394 U. S. 103, 22 L. Ed. 2d 113, 89 S. Ct. 956 (1969) | 9, 10 |
| International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, Local 37 v. Boyd, 347 U. S. 222, 98 L. Ed. 650, 74 S. Ct. 447 (1953) | 11 |
| Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee v. McGrath, 341 U. S. 123, 95 L. Ed. 817, 71 S. Ct. 624 (1950) | 6, 9 |
| Local No. 483 v. Curry, 371 U. S. 542, 9 L. Ed. 2d 514, 83 S. Ct. 531 (1963) | 8 |
| Massachusetts v. Mellon, 262 U. S. 447, 67 L. Ed. 1078, 43 S. Ct. 597 (1923) | 12 |

PAGE

Mercantile National Bank v. Langdeau, 371 U. S. 555, 9 L. Ed. 2d 523, 83 S. Ct. 520 (1963) ..... 8

North Dakota Pharmacy Board v. Snyder's Stores, 414 U. S. 156, 38 L. Ed. 2d 379, 94 S. Ct. 407 (1973) ..... 6-8

Pichler v. Jennings, 347 F. Supp. 1061 (S. D. N. Y. 1972) ..... 7

Poe v. Ullman, 367 U. S. 497, 6 L. Ed. 2d 989, 81 S. Ct. 1752 (1961) ..... 9, 12

Radio Station WOW, Inc. v. Johnson, 326 U. S. 123, 89 L. Ed. 2092, 65 S. Ct. 1475 (1944) ..... 5, 7, 8

Republic Natural Gas Co. v. Oklahoma, 334 U. S. 62, 92 L. Ed. 1212, 68 S. Ct. 972 (1947) ..... 4, 6-8

Rescue Army v. Municipal Court City of Los Angeles, 331 U. S. 549, 91 L. Ed. 1666, 67 S. Ct. 1409 (1946) ..... 9

United Public Workers v. Mitchell, 330 U. S. 75, 91 L. Ed. 754, 67 S. Ct. 556 (1946) ..... 10, 11

Wheeler v. Barrera, —— U. S. —— 41 L. Ed. 2d 159, 94 S. Ct. 2274 (1974) ..... 11

**Statute Cited**

28 U.S.C.:

Sec. 1257 ..... 4, 5

Sec. 1257(3) ..... 5

**Rule Cited**

R. 4:10-3 ..... 6

**Other Authority Cited**

73 Yale L. J. 515, 516, 523, 526 (1964) ..... 5, 7, 8

IN THE

# Supreme Court of the United States

**No. 74-1421**

PAUL CASHEN and IRENE CASHEN,

*Petitioners,*

*vs.*

FRANK SPANN, ROBERT BICKLEY, CHARLES M. EGAN, JR., JOHN DUNNE, individually and as servant, agent or employee of CHARLES EGAN, JR., "JOHN DOE," being a fictitious name of the "Reliable Informer," NEW JERSEY BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY, ANTHONY DE BIASI, THE COUNTY OF MORRIS and the BOROUGH OF WHARTON,

*Respondents.*

**On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey**

## BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

## Procedural History

The plaintiffs, Paul and Irene Cashin, commenced the subject lawsuit in Superior Court, Essex County, against Frank Spann, Robert Bickley, Charles M. Egan, Jr., "John Doe", being a fictitious name of the reliable informant, New Jersey Bell Telephone Company, Anthony DiBiasi, County of Morris and the Borough of Wharton. The original Complaint was filed May 19, 1971 and all defendants properly filed Answers. The plaintiffs then filed an Amended Complaint on December 2, 1971 and this was properly answered as well by all defendants. Venue was transferred to Morris County by an Order entered on September 15, 1971 by the Honorable Brendan T. Byrne, J.S.C.

After all discovery pertaining to the Borough of Wharton was completed, that defendant moved for summary judgment to dismiss the Complaint. Said motion was argued and granted on May 12, 1972. Throughout substantial discovery proceedings by the plaintiffs, these defendants refused to reveal the name of the reliable informant. Consequently, the plaintiffs moved for an Order compelling these defendants to answer Interrogatories requesting said name.

Subsequently, these defendants and defendant New Jersey Bell Telephone Company both moved for summary judgment to dismiss the Complaint. The plaintiffs' and the remaining defendants' motions were argued on June 9, 1972 before the Honorable Alexander P. Waugh, who was at that time Assignment Judge of the Superior Court, Morris County, and is now retired from the judiciary.

The plaintiffs' motion was denied. Both defendants' summary judgments motions were granted.



The plaintiffs appealed from all of the above rulings and no appeal from the summary judgment in favor of the defendant Borough of Wharton was taken. The Appellate Division on November 2, 1973 rendered their decision affirming summary judgment in favor of defendants Prosecutor Egan, DeBiasi, County of Morris and New Jersey Bell Telephone Company and reversing the summary judgment in favor of Bickley, Spann and Dunne. The Court also ordered the disclosure of the identity of the informer referred to in Bickley's affidavit.

Certification was granted by the New Jersey Supreme Court on May 14, 1974. Judgment was rendered on February 25, 1975. Justice Pashman, speaking for a unanimous court, affirmed the Appellate Division as modified. The Court remanded the issue of disclosure of the informant's identity to the trial court for further factual findings assuming the plaintiffs pursued their motion for discovery and the defendants continued to resist disclosure. The plaintiffs have chosen to petition the United States Supreme Court for a Writ of Certiorari rather than pursue any remedy in the trial court.

## Counter-Statement of Facts

This civil lawsuit has arisen out of an investigation by these defendants, members of the Morris County Prosecutor's office into illegal gambling activities in the Morris County area. The investigation primarily concerned four individuals, Raymond Dragos, Johnny Gallo a/k/a John Peragallo, Stanley Mosher and Thomas O'Mara, who were, as a direct result of this involved investigation, arrested, indicted and, subsequently, pleaded guilty to various charges of illegal gambling activities.

As a minor part of this investigation, the name Paul Cashen, plaintiff herein, came to the attention of the

Prosecutor's office in a manner, which after being responsibly checked out, gave probable cause for a search of his home, car and person for evidence of gambling activities.

The search warrant in this case was issued by the Honorable Jacques Gascoyne, J.C.C. after a finding by His Honor of probable cause.

The search was properly conducted by the Prosecutor's office with the aid of the Borough of Wharton Police Department and the search revealed no such evidence and the plaintiff's name was then completely stricken from any aspect of the balance of the investigation.

The amended Complaint is grounded in theories of negligence, as well as intentional wrong doing on the part of these defendants. The specific acts alleged are false arrest and imprisonment, slander, libel and assault.

## *REASONS FOR DENYING THE WRIT*

## POINT I

**Under 28 U.S.C. §1257 there was no final judgment or decree, therefore, the court should not exercise jurisdiction.**

The burden of affirmatively establishing the jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court rests with petitioners. "The policy against premature constitutional adjudications demands that any doubts in maintaining this burden be resolved against jurisdiction." *Republic Natural Gas Co.* v. *Oklahoma*, 334 U. S. 62, 71, 92 L. Ed. 1212, 1221, 68 S. Ct. 972 (1947). Petitioners merely state that jurisdiction is invoked under 28 U.S.C. §1257(3) without any further substantiation.



Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1257, a writ of certiorari can only be granted to review a final judgment or decree rendered by the highest state court.

> "Amendments or statutory exceptions to this rule have never been attempted, in striking contrast to the tendency toward statutory liberalization within the federal and state judiciaries." 73 *Yale L. J.* 515, 523.
>
> "This prerequisite to review derives added force when the jurisdiction of this Court is invoked to upset the decision of a State Court. Here we are in the realm of potential conflict between the courts of two different governments . . . This requirement is not one of those technicalities to be easily scorned. It is an important factor in the smooth working of our federal system." *Radio Station WOW, Inc.* v. *Johnson*, 326 U. S. 123, 124, 89 L. Ed. 2092, 2097, 65 S. Ct. 1475 (1944).

The Judgment of the Supreme Court of New Jersey, the highest state court, was entered on February 25, 1975 and is attached to the Petition for Writ of Certioari as Appendix B. The court, in an opinion reported at 66 N. J. 541 (1975), affirmed the judgment of the Appellate Division as modified with respect to disclosure of the identity of the informer. Justice Pashman, speaking for a unanimous court, stated,

> "While we are satisfied that the Appellate Division correctly identified the balancing test to be applied in cases such as this one, we doubt that either the trial court or the Appellate Division had before it an adequate record to actually perform

the delicate and difficult balancing of interests called for. Hence we vacate the order of the Appellate Division directing disclosure of the identity of the informant."

*Cashen, supra,* 66 N. J. at 555, Appendix B at 17a. If, on remand, the plaintiffs press their motion to compel discovery and the defendants move for a protective order pursuant to R. 4:10-3 to resist discovery, the trial court would then be required to consider all the facts involved in applying the balancing test. The court then proceeded to suggest factors to be considered in evaluating the interest of the various parties. The judgment of the New Jersey Supreme Court cannot be considered final in light of the remand for additional fact finding.

Although "no self-enforcing formula defining when a judgment is 'final' can be devised," *Republic Natural Gas, supra,* 334 U. S. at 67, 92 L. Ed. at 1219, "government action is 'final' . . . when at no future time will its impact on the petitioner become more conclusive, definite or substantial." *Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee* v. *McGrath,* 341 U. S. 123, 155, 95 L. Ed. 817, 844, 71 S. Ct. 624 (1950). In the instant case, the impact on petitioners presently is unknown. It will become more definite when and if the trial court ascertains the necessary facts and applies the balancing test.

> "The finality requirement . . . serves several ends:
>
> (1) it avoids piecemeal review by federal courts of state court decisions; (2) it avoids giving advisory opinions in cases where there may be no real 'case' or 'controvery' in the sense of Article III; (3) it limits federal review of state court determinations of federal constitutional issues to leave at a minimum federal intrusion in state affairs." *North*



> *Dakota Pharmacy Board* v. *Snyder's Stores,* 414 U. S. 156, 159, 38 L. Ed. 2d 379, 383, 94 S. Ct. 407 (1973). "It (the finality requirement) avoids the mischief of economic waste and of delayed justice." *Radio Station WOW, supra,* 326 U. S. at 124, 89 L. Ed. at 2097. It ". . . also increases the likelihood that the appellate court will have before it all the facts and issues necessary to reach an informed judgment. In this respect, finality is analogous to ripeness. The record must be sufficiently complete so that issues material to the decision have been determined in the lower courts." 73 *Yale L. J.* 515, 516 (1964).

In the case at bar, the record is not sufficiently complete which is precisely why the New Jersey Supreme Court remanded it to the trial court. This is not a situation where ". . . nothing more than a ministerial act remains to be done, . . . and the decree is regarded as concluding the case and is immediately reviewable." *Republic Natural Gas, supra,* 334 U. S. at 68, 92 L. Ed. at 1219. "The need for factual referents to narrow the issues in a given case is of recognized importance in determining justiciability." *Pichler* v. *Jennings,* 347 F. Supp. 1061, 1066 (S. D. N. Y. 1972). And in another case, the Court would not decide "the constitutionality of a state statute of doubtful construction in advance of its application and construction by the state courts and without reference to some precise set of facts to which it is to be applied." *Alabama State Federation of Labor* v. *McAdory,* 325 U. S. 450, 462, 89 L. Ed. 1725, 1735, 65 S. Ct. 1384 (1944). Thus, the remand for further factual determination cannot be dismissed as a mere ministerial act.

Nor does the present case fit within other exceptions to the finality rule. Until fairly recently the Court has only

entertained the appeal of an order which might be deemed interlocutory when the losing party would be irreparably injured if review was denied. *Republic Natural Gas, supra,* 334 U. S. at 68, 92 L. Ed. at 1220. The petitioners will not be precluded from petitioning the Court should the Trial Court rule against disclosing the informant's identity. Thus there is no irreparable injury. More recent cases may have broadened the exceptions. See *Local No. 483* v. *Curry,* 371 U. S. 542, 9 L. Ed. 2d 514, 83 S. Ct. 531 (1963); *Mercantile National Bank* v. *Langdeau,* 371 U. S. 555, 9 L. Ed. 2d 523, 83 S. Ct. 520 (1963); *North Dakota Pharmacy Board* v. *Snyder's Stores, supra.* However, in the latter case a close reading will show Justice Douglas was concerned because there was no way to preserve the constitutional question if the North Dakota Supreme Court judgment was held not final. *Snyder's Stores, supra,* 414 U. S. at 162, 38 L. Ed. 2d at 385. As stated above, the constitutional question in the case at bar will not be lost if the Court declines to rule that the judgment was final and thus not review the case.

In the former, it was held that the questions of jurisdiction and venue had been finally decided by the state courts below even though the whole case had not been finally determined. "In effect, such a controversy is a multiple litigation allowing review of the adjudication which is concluded because it is independent of, and unaffected by, another litigation with which it happens to be entangled." *Radio Station WOW, supra,* 326 U. S. at 126, 89 L. Ed. at 2099, The newer interpretations of 'finality' would seem "only to exclude cases where, because a determination appealed from could not be separated from the merits of the litigation, still pending before the state court, the Court in granting review would be passing on an issue not ripe for decision." 73 *Yale L. J.* 515, 526. The issue of disclosure in the instant case is inextricably



bound up in the merits of the litigation and is not susceptible of independent review. The petitioners themselves admit the informant's information is the crux of the whole matter and state that disclosure of the identity is necessary for cross-examination of the defendants and testing their probable defenses. Thus the issue of disclosure cannot be separated from the central cause of action. The issue has not been finally decided in the state courts. To avoid unwarranted interference jurisdiction should not be exercised.

## POINT II

**Jurisdiction should not be exercised inasmuch as the constitutional questions presented are premature and not ripe for decision.**

The United States Supreme Court has continually followed the policy of not deciding constitutional questions unless it is absolutely necessary. See *Golden* v. *Zwickler,* 394 U. S. 103, 110, 22 L. Ed. 2d 113, 118, 89 S. Ct. 956 (1969); *Poe* v. *Ullman,* 367 U. S. 497, 503, 6 L. Ed. 2d 989, 996, 81 S. Ct. 1752 (1961); *Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee* v. *McGrath* (Frankfurter concurrence), 341 U. S. 123, 154, 95 L. Ed. 817, 845, 71 S. Ct. 624 (1950); *Rescue Army* v. *Municipal Court City of Los Angeles,* 331 U. S. 549, 568, 91 L. Ed. 1666, 1678, 67 S. Ct. 1409 (1946); *Alabama State Federation of Labor* v. *McAdery,* 325 U. S. 450, 460, 89 L. Ed. 1725, 1734, 65 S. Ct. 1384 (1944); *Ashwander* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (Brandeis concurrence), 297 U. S. 288, 345, 80 L. Ed. 688, 710, 56 S. Ct. 466 (1935). "Considerations of propriety, as well as long-established practice, demand that we refrain from passing upon the constitutionality of an act of Congress unless obliged to do so in the proper

performance of our judicial function, when the question is raised by a party whose interests entitle him to raise it." *Blair* v. *United States,* 250 U. S. 273, 279, 63 L. Ed. 979, 981, 39 S. Ct. 468 (1919).

In determining when review of a constitutional question is absolutely essential the Court has reiterated that it does not have the power to give advisory opinions. See *Golden, supra,* 394 U. S. at 108, 22 L. Ed. 2d at 117; *Ashwander, supra,* 297 U. S. at 346, 80 L. Ed. at 710. Its jurisdiction is limited to actual cases and controversies; a hypothetical threat is not enough. *Golden, supra,* 394 U. S. at 110, 22 L. Ed. 2d at 118; *McAdory, supra,* 325 U. S. at 460, 89 L. Ed. at 1734; *United Public Workers* v. *Mitchell,* 330 U. S. 75, 89, 91 L. Ed. 754, 767, 67 S. Ct. 556 (1946). Justice Brandeis, concurring in *Ashwander, supra,* 297 U. S. at 346, 80 L. Ed. at 710 stated:

> "The court developed, for its own governance in the cases confessedly within its jurisdiction, a series of rules under which it has avoided passing upon a large part of all the constitutional questions pressed upon it for decision."

Two of the rules are particularly pertinent to the case at bar: "(2) The Court will not 'anticipate a question of constitutional law in advance of the necessity of deciding it' . . . (5) The Court will not pass upon the validity of a statute upon complaint of one who fails to show that he is injured by its operation." *Ashwander, supra,* 297 U. S. at 346-347, 80 L. Ed. at 711.

With reference to the former, to avoid anticipation, the controversy must be immediate and real, ripe for review when it is before the Court. "Determination of the scope and constitutionality of legislation in advance of its immediate adverse effect in the context of a concrete



case involves too remote and abstract an inquiry for the proper exercise of the judicial function." *International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, Local 37* v. *Boyd,* 347 U. S. 222, 224, 98 L. Ed. 650, 652, 74 S. Ct. 447 (1953). The instant case in its present state is too remote and abstract an inquiry for consideration. In similar situations this has been the result reached by the United States Supreme Court. In *United Public Workers* v. *Mitchell, supra,* 330 U. S. at 93, 91 L. Ed. at 769 Justice Reed stated:

> "as no prior proceeding, offering an effective remedy or otherwise, is pending in the courts, there is no problem of judicial discretion as to whether to take cognizance of this case."

In the present case there is a problem because there is a proceeding in the state court at the trial level which may in fact provide the petitioners with an adequate remedy. In a case last term, *Wheeler* v. *Barrera,* —— U. S. —— 41 L. Ed. 2d 159, 94 S. Ct. 2274 (1974), Justice Blackman speaking for the majority declined to render an opinion on the merits because the case had been remanded in the state court. The range of possibilities was too broad and the Court was reluctant to speculate as to what contingencies might arise. Similarly in the instant case, if the petitioners pursue their request for disclosure the defendants or the State could decide not to object. Or if the objection is made and there is a hearing to ascertain further facts the trial court could decide disclosure was required. Presently, it remains a matter of speculation which should not be reviewed at this time.

This leads to the fifth rule stated by Justice Brandeis in *Ashwander, supra.* Due to the premature nature of the petitioners' claim, they have not yet suffered any injury. Had the New Jersey Supreme Court ruled against

disclosure arguably they may have claimed injury. However, the decision was to remand the case to the trial court for further factual findings. The petitioners cannot meet the requirement set forth by Justice Frankfurter in *Poe* v. *Ullman, supra,* 367 U. S. at 505, 6 L. Ed. 2d at 997: "The party who invokes the power . . . must be able to show . . . that he has sustained or is immediately in danger of sustaining some direct injury as the result of its enforcement . . . *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon,* 262 U. S. 447, 488, 67 L. Ed. 1078, 1085, 43 S. Ct. 597 (1923)." Petitioners have failed to sustain the burden of demonstrating present injury or the immediate danger of injury.

The petitioners do not present this Court with a justiciable case. To grant review would go against the long established policy of not adjudicating cases which are not ripe nor immediate, but premature.

## CONCLUSION

**The respondents have not addressed the actual merits of this controversy in light of the compelling reasons for not granting the Writ of Certiorari. The case as presented by petitioners is not ripe for adjudication which is evidenced by the lack of a final judgment from the New Jersey State Supreme Court. For the foregoing reasons, the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari should be denied.**

Respectfully submitted,

STEPHEN S. WEINSTEIN
A Professional Corporation
*Attorney for Respondents, Frank Spann, Robert Bickley and John Dunne*
By: STEPHEN S. WEINSTEIN